

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, November 18, 1995

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOODLATTE].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 18, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable BOB GOODLATTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, You have made the heavens and the Earth and given to Your people the miracles of life. Now it is our prayer that we will use the gifts You have freely given by translating our good words and noble intent into actions that promote justice and respect one for another. We admit that it is easy to talk about Your blessings and yet we can neglect to see those blessings in another's work. Open our eyes to see the truth as best we can, open our ears to truly hear, and open our hands in the spirit of shared commitment and mutual concern. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SOLOMON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that 1-minute will be entertained at a later time.

WAIVING PROVISIONS OF CLAUSE 4(b), RULE XI, AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 276 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on or before the legislative day of November 23, 1995, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) The bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) Any bill making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 276 waives clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee, against the same-day consideration of resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, on or before the legislative day of November 23, 1995.

This resolution covers special rules that provide for the consideration or disposition of the bill, H.R. 2491, providing for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, any amendment, any conference report, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference report thereon; and, to the consideration or disposition of any measure making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, as mentioned when the House first considered the two-thirds

waiver for the continuing appropriations resolution which the House passed on Thursday, November 16, House Resolution 276 is an expedited procedure to facilitate the same-day consideration of urgent legislative matters. Facilitating the passage of appropriations bills, and adopting a balance budget plan that will eliminate the Federal deficit in 7 years, are clearly urgent fiscal, legislative matters. The sooner we can pass the individual spending bills, the sooner Federal employees can be assured of a paycheck.

The House has now passed all 13 requisite appropriations bills, and 4 have now been signed into law: Military construction, Agriculture, Energy and Water, and Transportation. Soon, the President will have the opportunity to sign legislation to fund Treasury, postal, executive branch, and legislative branch employees, and I am hopeful that excessive partisanship will not keep him from signing this important legislation.

While spending priorities are continuing to be negotiated with both the Senate and the President, it is important that the House be able to act immediately on the floor to consider any rule that deals with balancing the Federal budget and with any measure providing funds for expired appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], for yielding the customary 30 minutes of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we do not object to this resolution.

When we were in the majority, our Republican colleagues generally supported our requests to waive the two-thirds rule requirement. We obviously want to support any reasonable request to expedite the business of the House.

We are, however, fully aware of the circumstances that require the House to approve this waiver of the rule that requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported.

We really ought not to be in this situation, waiving standing rules of the House to wrap up major items on the legislative agenda in this rushed manner.

This particular resolution permits the House to take up the reconciliation bill as sent back to us by the Senate. It can certainly come as no surprise that several provisions, many of them very controversial, were removed from the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

reconciliation conference report by the Senate because of the Byrd rule.

This resolution will enable us to take up later today the rule and the Senate amendment to the House-passed reconciliation bill. We do not understand why the conferees agreed to a conference report they knew would fall apart because of the Byrd rule, forcing us to stand today to clean up after them.

The resolution also permits the House to take up any general appropriations measure as well. We Democrats support moving as many of them as possible so that the Government can return to full operations.

We do not think it is inaccurate to say that any problems the Democrats have with the bills are not the reasons they are stuck in conference, or in the Senate, and have not been sent to the President.

It is the very controversial and major policy matters that have been added to appropriations bills by the majority, in violation of our rules, that are for the most part causing intractable disagreements between Republican members of the other body and Republican members of the House and that are delaying the enactment of most of the outstanding appropriations measures.

If we cannot pass each of the remaining appropriations bills, then we encourage our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to seriously consider passing a continuing appropriations measure that is clean and straightforward.

We think that is the right thing to do; that is the only way we can treat the citizens of this country and Federal employees fairly. We should not be voting on conference agreements that this rule will help us consider more quickly without having enough time to evaluate the contents as thoroughly as we should.

Mr. Speaker, we repeat we are not opposing this rule because we remain more than ready to expedite in a responsible manner the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I particularly thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], who also is a distinguished graduate of a great law school in Cleveland, OH, Case Western.

Mr. Speaker, I think that The Washington Post tells it all this morning: "Talks on 7-year Balanced Budget 'Goal' Collapse." According to the report, the President's chief of staff, Leon Panetta, told reporters, "We have made what I believe is a reasonable offer," and their offer was, instead of

using the words "firm commitment," which was what was in the continuing resolution, the President, the White House, will agree to using the word "goal."

Mr. Panetta goes on to say:

The purpose was to get people back to work and present Members of Congress with an approach that preserves everyone's options.

It could not possibly be more clear. The one option, the only option that is unacceptable is that we do not balance the budget in 7 years, and apparently that is the one single option that the White House wants to maintain. They want it to be a goal; we want it to be a firm commitment. Nothing about how we get there, nothing about whether we raise taxes or lower taxes, what we do with Medicare part B premiums, what we do with Medicare part A trust funds, nothing about how we spend the money, how we do not spend the money; none of that is in the continuing resolution.

The only thing that our continuing resolution says that was passed by this Congress in a bipartisan manner with 48 Members among my friends from the other side, the only thing it says is that we are committed to balancing the budget. The President wants it to be a goal to balance the budget.

Now, I ask my colleagues, what does that say? Is it not obvious that if the wiggle-worm you want is that it is a goal rather than a commitment, you are clearly saying you do not want to balance the budget. That is what it boils down to. It is crystal-clear.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate deeply Mr. Panetta making it more and more clear on a daily basis, so that the American people can see that the real difference here between the White House and the Congress is a genuine, absolute unqualified commitment to bringing prosperity, to bringing something that our children deserve, to bringing a balanced budget to the United States of America for the first time in 25 years.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended at this early hour to begin rehashing this stuff again, but given the comments of the last speaker, I think I need to make a few observations.

Mr. Speaker, we are here on Saturday working on a weekend at the same time most Government workers are being prevented from working on weekdays because we have an impasse over the continuing resolution. The continuing resolution is necessitated by the fact that this Congress has not done its work.

We still have over 85 percent of the appropriations part of the Federal

budget which has not yet been approved by the Congress; and because of that, we have to have a resolution continuing the financing of the Government. Our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, led by Mr. GINGRICH, are using the fact that Congress has not done its work to try to spill other issues into the continuing resolution; and they want to get a debate going before we even sit down in conference on the budget, and they want to get a debate going dealing with the issues involved in the 7-year budget.

Now, it just seems to me that there is no useful purpose to be served by continuing that linkage. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] just said that because the President is objecting to the language that the Speaker wanted with respect to 7 years, that somehow that means the President does not want to balance the budget.

□ 0915

That is nonsense. Let's simply stipulate facts.

The House, in dragging an extraneous issue into this discussion is saying that they want us to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years using the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. Period. And they want the White House to sign on to that statement. That is impossible for the White House to do, because that is not the White House position. It is perfectly reasonable for the Congress to state its own position in a continuing resolution. It is not reasonable for the Congress to expect that the President sign on to a statement that he does not believe in.

The issue is very simple. The President has indicated that he would like to see a balanced budget, but the timetable is going to be determined frankly by the size of the tax cut. Obviously if you are going to need \$200 billion extra on the tax side, it is going to take you longer to reach a budget balance than if you are going to have zero dollars on the tax side.

The President also wants to remain flexible in terms of the timetable because that timetable is also determined to some extent by the way you measure the budget, whether the Congressional Budget Office measures it or somebody else. So basically the administration has wanted to go into these negotiations with no preconditions, and the majority party in this House seeks to impose preconditions before the negotiations ever start.

But you have two illegitimate approaches in my view. You first of all have an extraneous issue of what the timetable is going to be on another bill being debated in the process when all we need to do to solve this problem is to pass a simple, clean continuing resolution, and then in addition to that they want to drag in yet another extraneous condition demanding that the

President go into the negotiations with the same set of assumptions held by the Speaker of the House.

That simply is not factual to expect the President to buy those assumptions, and it seems to me the height of unreasonableness to drag the entire country through this debate simply because the Speaker wants the President to say: "I agree with every assumption held by Mr. GINGRICH." The fact is he does not, and whatever continuing resolution that is passed ought to simply admit that. It should not get into the issue at all, but if it insists, it ought to simply admit that there are differences between the parties as we go into negotiations.

I also want to take just a moment to express my concern about what this rule is going to do when coupled with the next rule coming out of the Committee on Rules. We are being told that there will be put on suspension one bill which allows the continuation of three additional functions in the Government, but evidently it has been determined that no other functions in the Government ought to be allowed to continue.

It seems to be that the very fact that that bill is going to be brought before us demonstrates that the majority party recognizes that it is illegitimate to be holding up the Government. And when that bill comes to the floor, we will face the question, well, if you are going to do it for certain aspects of the Social Security Administration or certain aspects of the Veterans' Administration, why should you not also allow people to continue their work if by doing so they can keep national parks open so that people do not have to spend a good deal of money to go on vacation only to find out the money has been wasted because of a silly spat in the Congress? Why should we not also expand it to provide for the continuation of all work necessary in the Justice Department to go after drug dealers? Why should we not also allow the Government to function in cases where, for instance, in the case of Gallaudet University, which is about to have to close because of this impasse, why should we not allow them to continue to operate? Why should we not allow all elderly nutrition activities at the Department of Health and Human Services to continue? Why should we not allow all civil rights and anti-discrimination law enforcement activities to continue?

There are a lot of other legitimate areas of activity. I have had a number of Republican Members of the House talk to me about concerns that they have about some of their constituents who cannot get passports and who have an immediate family crunch on their hands. But this is not going to allow that activity to continue.

It just seems to me that the previous speaker mentioned in a condemnatory

tone the offer that Mr. Panetta made last night. Let me simply read the language that Mr. Panetta offered.

It says, "The goal of negotiations is to enact a budget agreement that balances the budget in 7 years under Congressional Budget Office economic assumptions, or in a timeframe and under economic assumptions agreed to by the negotiators."

I have a suggestion. If you do not like that as a goal, or as a commitment, put into the language whatever your commitment is and allow the President to put into the language whatever his commitment is, so that the two sides are simply stating the facts, without attacking each other, without trying to score points against each other. Just simply you state how you see the framing of the negotiations, and have the White House state how it sees the framing of the negotiations. Instead of debating each other, simply state the facts and move on.

What would be wrong with that? All the President is trying to convey is that the two sides are known to have an occasional disagreement on these issues, and I myself must say that I think you will find a lot of Members on this side of the aisle who are interested in a 7-year timetable to balance the budget provided that you are not providing huge tax cuts, especially to higher income people which force you to make deeper cuts in education, force you to make deeper cuts in Medicaid, for instance, than we think would be justifiable. If those tax cuts are smaller you can speed up the time frame for balancing the budget. That is simple logic. I do not see why we need to get involved in a long, protracted debate that keeps 800,000 Government workers out of their offices just because we want to continue on this resolution to pretend that everybody is in agreement when they are not. Not on this resolution but on the other resolution that at this point is in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge our friends on the other side of the aisle to simply quit belaboring the point, allow the process to continue. I will have a number of motions that I will be making today on subsequent legislation before this House to try to expand the number of activities which are allowed to proceed. To me, when I look at the next bill coming, my impression from reading that bill is that somebody had decided, "Well, let's move on the three items that we are taking the most political heat on so that we can continue to hold everybody else hostage."

They may be convenient politically but it is not the right thing to do on the merits, it is not practical thing to do. We have no objection to expanding or to opening up of Government for those functions, but we think we ought to go beyond that and stop this institutional temper tantrum.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is precisely because the President and Congress are known to occasionally have a disagreement that the President when he submitted his budget recommended that the Congressional Budget Office be utilized to score his budget. All we are saying is that within the next 7 years when we balance the budget, we should use the Congressional Budget Office. That is the entity, because of its seriousness and its history and its competence, the President recommended be used when he came before us here to submit his own budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I do not know how we got off on to this. What we are considering here is a rule that is going to let us work today and expedite the work of the House. We all agree that we want to get the Government back running at 100 percent. We may disagree on how big we want the Government to be in the future. That does not have anything to do with this debate today. This rule if it is adopted is going to allow this Congress today to be able to take up bills like the Veterans and HUD appropriation bill that is terribly important that we get that to the President, the DC appropriations, that is very important, especially to people around the Washington, DC, area; the Interior appropriations bill, the Commerce-Justice-State bill.

But the point I want to make is that the House has been moving legislation. I just had a conversation with my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], saying that the President will sign the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill and the legislative bill just as soon as we get it there. I think he is going to sign all of these bills.

Let me tell you what we have done so far. Right now signed into law we have the military construction bill. That is already signed by the President. We have the Agriculture appropriation bill signed by the President. We have Energy and Water appropriations signed by the President. We have Transportation appropriations, signed by the President. That takes in a good hunk of the entire Government. Plus we have cleared for the President the legislative branch, which I just mentioned. That will be on its way to the President as soon as he says he is going to sign it. The Treasury-Post Office, that takes in a great hunk of the Government. The President evidently has said he is going to sign that. We are going to send that over there this morning. The national

security defense bill. Terribly important. That bill is ready to go and will probably go this morning.

You can go right down the line. On the Veterans and HUD bill, as soon as I get a quorum of the Committee on Rules, we are going to go upstairs to the Committee on Rules, and I am going to put out a rule bringing that to the floor as soon as we possibly can. We are doing everything we can to be cooperative. But when I hear my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], take the well and kind of stir things up again, let us today try to cooperate and do the business of the House and get the Government back to work. We can do it if we put aside this partisan bickering.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I think he is correct. If we put aside this partisan bickering, we could in fact move forward. My friend knows we do have differences. He and I are good friends and we differ on issues. Both sides of the aisle differ on issues. What we are trying to do is move this forward.

One of the frustrations I have, as the gentleman knows, is that you are absolutely correct when you represent that there may be a difference in the size of Government, but there is not a difference in the fact that the size that we agree on should continue to operate effectively and efficiently. That could be accomplished, of course, by what we call a simple CR; that is, simply saying at such level as can be agreed upon Government will operate while we debate.

□ 0930

The problem we have, as all of us know, is that for the last eight or nine words as to whether or not we agree on a particular formulation to get to a balanced budget, which is not per se affected by the operations of Government, obviously the operations of Government and the size will be affected by the balanced budget, but not the other way around. I do not know whether we can get there. I would hope during today that we all work very diligently to try to come up with some sort of formula that will get the Government back to work on Monday while we debate the differences that we have, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I hope that is the direction we can go.

Mr. SOLOMON. As the gentleman knows, I have a great deal of respect for our Federal employees. You know there are a lot of good employees out there, and they work for less than the private sector. They are conscientious, and I do not like to see people up here nitpicking them.

I personally want to abolish certain departments and shrink the size of the Government, but again we have to keep that Government functioning and with the good employees that we do have here.

Again, I just hope we can move this legislation. As soon as we adopt this rule, we take up the second one. We will go right upstairs and we will get the VA-HUD bill out here so we can get the Government back working.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the rule.

I would just like to make a few statements here. I did not vote for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, nor did I vote for the Republican plan on reconciliation in the budget, 7 years. I did vote for the continuing resolution that says the President and the leaders of the Congress sit down and, in the time frame of 7 years with no mandates placed on how they reach that, to go ahead and balanced budget.

Every American wants a balanced budget. I do, too. Let us tell it like it is here today. The deficit is exactly what has been stated in the paper. The Congress says we commit to a 7-year budget. The White House is now saying our goal is 7 years or a mutually agreeable time frame that these negotiators would reach.

Let us get on with it. I have never heard of one President in the last 20 years that ran for office who did not make a commitment to balancing the budget. Now, the President made a commitment in the campaign for 5 years. When I voted for that CR, it did not say to the President how and what he must do. I had confidence the President would say, "Let's take care of Medicare." That is my concern too.

But I want to tell you something here on the House floor, the American people are confused. They are confused that people are not back to work and they are confused because they know, and what bothers me is we will not balance the budget with the trade numbers we have at record levels. Our balance of payments is negative, and each year continues to be negative, and we have a tax code that is destroying growth. There is nothing in here that changes that tax code, and I voted for the tax cut. I think we are overtaxed, overregulated. We are chasing jobs away, ladies and gentlemen.

Let me say this: If the difference that is keeping 800,000 workers home, shutting down our government, is the difference between goals and commitment, then beam me up here, Mr. Speaker, we have failed.

I am recommending here today that the Democrats and Republicans and the White House get together in a small room, turn up the heat, chili,

baked beans hard-boiled eggs, close the doors and nobody leave the room until they work out the differences with some words.

All the Democrats, all the Republicans make all of these campaign promises. I did not even vote for the promises you make, but damn it, if you have a commitment when you are running, you should have a commitment once you are elected, and both parties should get on with the commitment to our Government.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished new Member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio who preceded me here in the well because I think he refocused the real issue here.

I listened with great interest to the distinguished ranking member on the minority side from appropriations when he offered the following construct. He said, if I can remember his words accurately, that what was going on here was an exercise essentially to get the President of the United States to agree with the goal of the Speaker. With all due respect to my good friend from Wisconsin, I am simply asking, and I think the majority of the Members of this House are simply asking, is for the President to finally come to agreement with himself.

The words are here from the State of the Union Address, February 17, 1993, the President's first State of the Union message, which I watched as a private citizen. Quoting the President now, "I will point out that the Congressional Budget Office was normally more conservative about what was going to happen and closer to right than previous Presidents have been. I did this so we could argue about priorities with the same set of numbers."

The President Clinton of 1993 stated it clearly. The President Clinton of 1995 takes a different view, and as my good friend from Wisconsin pointed out when he disagreed with the President even committing to the notion of a balanced budget, in the new incarnation from the President, over 10 years, he said words to the effect, if you do not agree with President Clinton wait around, his position is bound to change. I respect my good friend from Wisconsin for that observation as well.

So let our friends from the minority join with us in the majority again to renew our commitment to these honest numbers given us by the Congressional Budget Office, commit to the goal and the reality of a balanced budget within 7 years.

In the meantime, while the disagreements continue, in the meantime, as we work to get past this impasse, let us work today where we can make change, where we can restore the rightful job responsibilities and the activities of the Federal Government; therefore, let

us move, let us move to say "yes" to the rule, and "yes" to the legislation at hand as we move in a reasonable, rational manner to restrain, yes, but also to restore the essential functions of government.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and simply want to clarify even more some statements made by the gentleman from Arizona regarding what the President said in 1993.

The President said that those CBO numbers were the most accurate numbers because they had been the most conservative. But the fact of the matter is, even for the 12 years prior to the President's 1993 statements, those CBO numbers will be too optimistic, and we have seen administrations on both sides of the aisle, Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, use rosy scenarios that ended up causing crushing Federal debt and a crushing Federal deficit.

We have got to get serious on this, and we need to hold the President down. I have 25,000 Federal employees in my district. There is nobody who wants to see Federal employees go back to work more than I do.

But what is at stake here today and throughout this next week is making sure, when they go back, that we will finally have the President nailed down to a framework and a commitment to balance the budget. As the ranking member from Wisconsin said earlier this year, if you do not agree with what the President is saying, just wait around a couple weeks, he is sure to change his mind again. Well we cannot afford that anymore. This is a President who campaigned to balance the budget in 5 years. It is a President who earlier this year, as the Washington Post said this morning, sent a budget to the Senate that had no end to deficits in sight. It was voted down 99 to nothing. Then he came back earlier this year and said that he might want to balance the budget in 10 years. Then he came down to 7. Then he went back to 9. And now we finally have him folding and coming back to 7 years.

Now he says he wants to use OMB numbers, numbers that he himself criticized harshly 2 years ago.

So let us go ahead and pass this rule, get on with the business of the day, get this Government started back up, but do it in a way that will ensure financial sanity for future generations.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished new Member, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is day 5 of the President's decision to furlough nonessential Federal employees.

I was watching the debate in my office this morning, and I have to confess

that at least there is one form of amusement that is still open in the city of Washington, and that is listening to the convoluted explanations of the minority party as to why the President does not need to balance the budget.

I would remind everyone that in his campaign in 1992, he said that he was going to balance the Federal budget in 5 years. We are now in the third year of his term, and, very frankly, I think a 7-year plan is a reasonable alternative. We are giving him 4 more years to do the job he said he could do than he has asked for. I think that that is an important issue.

It is also important that we understand that after this morning we are now going to have two choices on the President's desk. One is a clean continuing resolution. All that it asks for is a 7-year commitment to a balanced budget scored fairly by the Congressional Budget Office. And No. 2 is, if he does not want to do the heavy lifting and make the tough decisions that need to be made, we have also presented him with a 7-year plan.

Can we improve on it? You bet we can improve on it. We can improve on it if we could get an administration to work with us to make the tough decisions we need to make.

Mr. Speaker, I have one word for the House of Representatives: Just balance the budget.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman from Maine just said, and we all know what is going on. The President is trying to make his point, and the Republicans are trying to make their point.

The gentleman from Maine, who is new here but, I am convinced, knows full well that if all the appropriation bills had been sent down and we had resolved the differences between the President and the House, which there are substantial differences, then we would not need a continuing resolution and Government would not be shut down.

The fact is, as the gentleman knows, that most of the appropriation bills have not been sent on to the President. As the gentleman also knows, there are substantial differences. As a matter of fact, there were substantial differences in your own party with reference to the Interior bill, which was recommitted with many votes from your side of the aisle.

Although we are going to move ahead, and I am not opposing this rule because I think we want to move ahead, everybody here knows there are substantive differences on the VA-HUD bill. There are substantive differences on the Commerce-State-Justice, both of which, in my opinion, will lead to the President's rejecting them on policy grounds.

The fact of the matter is you want to make your point, which is a political message point on the 7-year balanced budget. I understand that. But the fact of the matter is that sending messages, which is what you are doing, because, in my opinion, the CR for which I voted, as the gentleman probably knows, the last page, the 16th page, was a message page. It had no legal impact on either the Congress or the President. Ultimately, it was a message page trying to get him to sign on to something that he may then say, "Well, that is not exactly what I meant," and you would make the political point.

Mr. LONGLEY. If the gentleman will yield, why did he not just agree to it?

Mr. HOYER. For exactly the reason I just stated, I tell the gentleman from Maine. You are trying to send a message and put the President in a box which has nothing relating to the balanced budget. The question, the fact of the matter is, the balanced budget and bringing to balance within 7 years dealt with a bill that we passed yesterday and that I understand will be coming back from the Senate, the reconciliation bill.

□ 0945

That is the bill, as the gentleman must clearly know, on which we will debate this issue as to how to balance the budget, when to balance it, the time frame, and whether Medicare gets cut deeply while tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans are put in place. I do not want to get into partisan debate on those issues at this point in time, but it does not relate to the operations of Government on Monday, this coming week. The gentleman must know that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman, you know, it could be political somewhat. But let me just tell the gentleman something. It does have bearing on these appropriation bills. You know my feeling. I have been one of the leaders in biting the bullet and introducing balanced budgets for years here that really were hard to take. It was hard to take back home, because this cuts my constituents \$850 billion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the point is in 1985 we passed, what was it, Gramm-Rudman, and put us on this glidepath to the balanced budget. You know what happened. By 1990, it had disappeared.

We cannot let that happen again. Each one of these appropriations bills, and let me just digress for a minute, the reason it happened was because in each succeeding year, we did not follow through, and those appropriation bills, as the gentleman knows, did not follow the balanced budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my point is this is not politics. We do not want this to happen like it did before. We have to stay on that glidepath. The President, in good faith, needs to just affirm that he and we are going to work in that direction. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, a very quick comment. Whether we balance the budget on a 3-year, 5-year, 7-year, 10-year or never basis makes a fundamental difference in the way this Chamber will approach the budget. The question is we have to have some type of agreement on the fundamental principal that the Federal Government will live within its limits. We think the 7-year limit is the way to do it. Wouldn't it be better if we could work together toward that objective?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is clearly correct. However, let me comment on the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is my friend and for whom I have a great deal of respect. Essentially with Gramm-Rudman, both I and II, the gentleman knows that, the Committee on Appropriations was within 602(b) requirements every year. That was not the reason we did not get to balance under Gramm-Rudman, period. The Committee on Appropriations in fact in every one of those years, maybe save one, was appropriating less than Presidents Reagan and Bush asked for.

Having said that, I believe very strongly we have to get to balance. I voted for an amendment to do so, I voted for budgets to do so, and I voted for the coalition budget which gets there faster than your alternative. It does not do some of the policy things that you think are right to do, that I think are wrong to do. We are going to argue about that. But I say again to my friend from Maine, the continuing resolution—this is not the continuing resolution, we are debating a rule—but the continuing resolution, we are debating a rule—but the continuing resolution is not the document that gets you to balance, period.

Now, there is a difference between the President and the Congress. We will have to work that out in the Democratic process, and we will work it out within the context of reconciliation bills. In point of fact, the appropriation bills, which you are passing, are within your 602(b)'s. They are within the framework of spending that you have allotted.

All of those bills, he will sign them within the 602(b)'s. Within those 602(b)'s, we have differences. The American public has differences. They say in polls they are a third for one person, Powell, a third for Clinton, and about 30 percent for DOLE in a three-way. Now Powell has withdrawn. But the

American public has differences. They understand that. In their families they have to resolve differences. What they do not do in their families is shut off the heat, lock the house door and not let any of the family come in. They continue operations while they are trying to resolve their differences.

What you are trying to do, I suggest to the gentleman from Maine, is in effect lock the door, shut off the heat, and force the President to come to an agreement that he does not agree with.

In the past we have passed CR's which were relatively clean and that ultimately the President and the Congress agreed upon, because we never passed a CR over the President's veto, not once. Not once.

Did the gentleman hear me? The Democratic House and Senate never passed a CR over President Reagan or President Bush's veto. Not once, so that every agreement to carry out the operations of Government was done with an agreement ultimately between the President and the House and the Senate.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I would just add, for the benefit of the gentleman's information, that during the Reagan years I was not a Republican, I was not a Democrat, I was an Independent. My presence in this body should not be interpreted as in any way sanctioning what took place in this Congress during the 1980's.

When the President on Wednesday evening fundamentally rescinded any commitment whatsoever to a 7-year balanced budget, he has irrevocably changed the dynamic of our discussions with the administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as my friend saw on the front page of the Washington Post, "Clinton drops objection to ending deficit in 7 years." In fact, he reached agreement, as I understand it, essentially with the Senate yesterday on language that would have gotten us off of this disagreement.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and experienced gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate getting this time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate and looking at the votes and the comments that have been made over the last week, one would think that the two things that we were debating were President Clinton and Speaker GINGRICH. We seem to be in the dialog talking by each other. I know my friend from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, said that he was committed to the 7-year budget, but he also said that he did not like our priorities. I can understand that. That is why we have two political parties, and that is why we have differences of opinion even within the parties.

Unfortunately, what has happened here is I think that there have been too many ultimatums thrown out that have prevented people from bargaining. Unfortunately, the Speaker and the President have become the issue. There is no question, and we all know that President Clinton made a commitment for a 5-year budget when he ran for President. He now has gone, and we have all seen the TV advertisement that is on, that has him saying everything from 5 to 10 years. But one thing is in all of those statements and one thing that is in the thought of I think every Member in this House: We have got to go forward for a balanced budget.

Now, if the President had gotten on to the balanced budget, 7-year, and adopted that 2-years ago, we would only have 5 years left from today. But with our 7 years, that would have given him 9 years to balance the budget by putting our 7 years on top of the 2 years that he has already been in office.

Unfortunately, the Congress and the President have not moved forward. As everyone talks a good talk, no one is walking the good walk. We have got to go forward to a balanced budget.

Now, where do we go from here? The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] says we are sending messages. Yes, we are sending messages. We know the bill we are going to send over to the President is going to be vetoed. But let us have the President send a message back. The President says that he is willing to talk 7 years, but he is not willing to commit to 7 years, so we have a fundamental disagreement as to where you can get an honest count.

It is our position over here that what President Clinton agreed to early on of using the Congressional Budget Office is where we want to be and is where we want to stay, because we feel that is where we are going to get our honest count.

But, fine, instead of arguing over the scorekeeper, instead of arguing over all of these things and personalities, let the President send us a message back. Let him give us a 7-year budget, and let him use his scorekeepers, and we will have our scorekeepers score it. If we are anywhere close and if the thing can possibly be reconciled with the House budget, then, fine, let us negotiate that.

Let us get down to negotiating the specifics and quit throwing spears back and forth. The American people are fed up with it, it is time for this to stop, and we have got to move the agenda and move the debate to the facts and get on with the Government.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. One of the pieces of good news I think for the American public is

I think on the floor right now we have people, if we sat in a room we could resolve this frankly in about 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Could we sell it to either one of our caucuses? That is the question.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding further. Let me read three lines that were the offer of the President of the United States in substitution of the language that was in the CR, because I think it accomplishes what the gentleman from Florida just articulated.

The goal of the negotiations is to enact a budget agreement that balances the budget in 7 years under Congressional Budget Office's economic assumptions, or in a time-frame and under economic assumptions agreed to by the negotiators.

Your side did not like the last phrase, because it did not bind the President to the CBO assumptions. As the gentleman knows, he believes the CBO assumptions are not correct. There are many private sector economic analysts who also believe they are more conservative in terms of growth and other statistics.

Having said that, this language says 7 years, CBO as a basis, and it does leave, yes, some options for the negotiators to go beyond that. Clearly, it is not exactly what you wanted. But I suggest to my friend, it was offered in good faith to try to get to where your side believes we ought to go, and that is 7 years. I agree with that.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for a moment, that is just the point. That is exactly the point that I am making, is that we cannot agree on the scorekeeper. We want what is what we believe to be an honest scorekeeper, which is CBO. Fine, we cannot agree to that.

So that is what I am talking about. Let him go ahead and send us his balanced budget, and let us try to negotiate it, and then we will have it scored. He will use his scorekeeper; we will use ours. If we are going to get into an agreement on the CR, we feel very strongly we need to use the CBO figures, because the gentleman knows and I know, and we have been around here about the same length of time, if you adjust that interest rate or project an interest rate a quarter of a point, an eighth of a point, all of a sudden all of the economic assumptions change. This is what we call smoke and mirrors. You can develop an economic assumption so that anything would balance, even our current level of spending, if you come up with the right economic assumptions.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, we do both agree, do we not, this will ultimately be incorporated in the reconciliation bill, any agreement?

Mr. SHAW. Eventually, it will have to be translated into that.

Mr. HOYER. That is what we ought to debate it on, and not hold hostage

the operations of Government at whatever size, as the chairman says, we agreed on.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for his thoughtful statement. We are in this incredible situation where we seem to be arguing how you get to the table, and it is fairly simple: Go. The reality is that we need to pass a continuing resolution because Congress has not passed appropriation bills.

Let us get that taken care of and pass the CR. The majority, to their credit, passed a bill reflecting their view of how the budget should be balanced yesterday. I think it is a bad bill. I hope and know the President will veto it. Then you have to negotiate. Let us hope we do not end up quarreling whether it is a square or round table. Let us just get people there. Go.

Some of this discussion of scorekeeping, people have to exercise good judgment. The ultimate scorekeeper is Congress and the people who negotiate. CBO is advisory to us. I think we should follow their judgment. But, if they are wrong, then we should look at the facts.

The reality is in lots of programs, how you structure them depends on what demographics are projected. CBO may be right, OMB may be right, someone else may be right. The goal of negotiators should be to be as accurate as possible.

We tend to say we have this judgment on different predictors. They are all honest, hard-working folks, making their best judgment. Let us hear from them, figure out what is accurate, and structure programs appropriately.

Amazingly, I look at revenue projections for 1996, and CBO and OMB come out to the exact dollar, using different assumptions, different methodology. This is all crazy stuff we are talking about here. Let us get our work done. Let us get on with negotiations so we can solve the problem.

□ 1100

I think that is what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is saying.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the frustration, I think, that the American public has is that they see us saying, yes, we want to get to a balanced budget. The President now says that he is prepared to negotiate to get there in 7 years. I think

that is correct. Others differ, but I think that is correct.

The fact of the matter is, though, whatever CR we pass will not impact on it; it will be the reconciliation bill which has not yet passed this body. I understand it is coming back from the Senate today.

It will be on that bill that we will have to have this very substantive, sometimes contentious, but very important debate, because the gentleman is correct, those assumptions, as the chairman in exile of the Committee on the Budget points out, make a great deal of difference.

So I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. I appreciate the work he has done. I would hope that we could get this CR behind us and get Government operating and then come to grips with a very important, and I agree with the Speaker, historic debate on how we get the finances of this country under control and in order, priorities with which I know the chairman and I agree, but with which everybody in the body may not agree.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just make this observation. I happen to think we can balance the budget in 7 years. I do not want to balance it in 7 years under the Republican budget. I suspect they do not want to balance it in 7 years in a plan that I would draft.

So there are conditions by all of us. So we must sit down and try to work out a very, very difficult, but very important problem.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are now going to have this morning as a part of the rule the segment of the debate right now that deals with the rule to allow us to have legislation to be considered the same day that it comes out from the Committee on Rules.

What we have today before us, Mr. Speaker, is the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which has been slightly changed by the Senate for the House to consider. It is my belief that we should adopt that legislation for all Americans. The benefits of a balanced budget amendment will accrue to all Americans in decreased mortgage payments, decreased car payments, decreased tuitions and, hopefully, even decreases of health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, every other government, whether it be school district, township, borough, city, county, all balance their budgets, as well as families balance their budgets.

The original bill had Medicare reforms in it. We sent back to the President legislation which removed that. In

my opinion, and I think the opinion of most Members of this House, that should have been adopted by the President. If we have the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] oversee the President with the 7-year commitment, I am sure we could adopt that, and we could have the President join us in it.

The balanced budget amendment should be something unanimous. There is no one in this Chamber who is for an unbalanced budget. So I hope we will follow the guidance of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] when he says, let us get the President to the table, let us get it resolved, and for the benefit of all Americans, let us adopt the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the distinguished chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out several times in the course of this debate, the President came to the well of this House and told us in his 1993 message that it was time to stop relying on White House rosy estimates, and it was time to rely on the trustworthy estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. He got a standing ovation from the Democratic side of the aisle. We are asking him to keep that promise.

It has been pointed out by some, by one of our colleagues in debate yesterday that, well, that was when the Congressional Budget Office was on our Democratic payroll. However, we have to keep in mind that the Balanced Budget Act that we are going to be considering, one that we already voted on yesterday and that we hope comes back to us from the Senate, is based on the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, made under the direction of Robert Reischauer, who was the Democrats' appointee to head the CBO. June O'Neill did not come on to run the CBO until afterward.

These are the Democratic staff estimates at the CBO. All that happened in the August update under June O'Neill was to move those estimates slightly closer to what the White House had, so the White House is not going to be complaining about that.

There is a videotape that some of my colleagues may have seen that collects all of President Clinton's statements on how long it should take to balance the budget, back to back to back to back, all of his statements, starting with his appearance on the "Larry King Show" when he said, I am going to present a plan to the American people to balance the budget in 5 years.

Then he says, 7 years is the right period of time. Then 9 years, most recently 10 years, and then back between 7 and 9. Then he said 10 years and presented a plan to balance the budget in 10 years that, in fact, according to CBO, did not.

It is time for the President, who most recently now has said he will veto any 7-year budget, then even later said, maybe we will talk about it, to decide this question.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

I think the American public is a little tired of the Government chasing its tail, and I think we have started debate a little early, but I think that is really what it is going to be about over the next 7 years as we come to struggle with what is going to be inside that budget in 7 years.

It is that one phrase that the gentleman from Maryland brought up, I think, that bothers the American public so much. The options to go beyond 7 years. I know that the freshman class that I am a member of is very hard and fast on 7 years.

How many votes have come up in the last 20 years about the balanced budget? How many times has this body voted on a balanced budget? Many, many times. The real issue is, can we do it? Do we have the discipline? Everybody wants to say, yes, we do.

Well, let us put it in writing. Let us live by it. Let us negotiate the terms, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] said. Let us negotiate the terms of what is going to happen inside that balanced budget. But let us make a hard and fast rule, 7 years, let us draw a line and say, we can do it, and let us just argue about what is inside. I think that is what the American public wants, and I think that is certainly what the freshman class wants is a 7-year plan to balance the budget.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning to all my colleagues on this great Saturday morning, and I see the debate about balancing the budget continues to go on.

Yesterday, I think that the House and the Senate both proved to the American people that we can, in fact, balance the budget in 7 years. We did it. We brought the documents here, we laid them out, we had a great debate, and they passed on both Houses.

This issue over CBO numbers and OMB numbers, this is not just about numbers, it is about the fact that the President wants to spend \$875 billion more over the next 7 years than what we want to spend.

Mr. Speaker, if we can balance the budget in 7 years, which we proved yesterday, it is all about whether we are going to spend more of our children's inheritance, whether we are going to snatch more of the American dream away from our children, or whether we are going to stick to real numbers, certified by CBO; or whether we are going

to do the same thing the politicians in this town have done for 30 years. And that is, just kind of mush the numbers together, make them work, and sell out our children.

We are not going to do that.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], a dynamic and distinguished new Member.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I stand in support of this rule, because this rule is exactly why we are here. We are here because the American people sent us to do what every American family does, and that is to live within our means and to balance the budget. Republicans and a growing number of moderate and conservative Democrats agree, it is time to balance the budget.

Who stands in the way? The limousine liberals, the tax-and-spend Democrats oppose a plan to balance the budget.

We have a plan to balance the budget in a responsible fashion over the next 7 years.

By the way, we increase spending on Medicare by 54 percent, \$355 billion over the next 7 years. We reform welfare and emphasize work; we provide tax relief to working families.

Mr. Speaker, the telephone calls that I am receiving in my offices are nine-to-one in favor of balancing the budget and holding firm. Mike and Kay Shostic of Manhattan, IL, they say, hang tough. They have three kids who are counting on the Congress to balance the budget.

I say to my colleagues, it is time to get the job done. Let us balance the budget; let us work together.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Laundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2126) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 1058) "An Act to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRAMM, Mr.

BENNETT, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. BRYAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

H. RES. 275

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Saturday, November 18, 1995, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules: *Provided*, That the object of any motion to suspend the rules is announced from the House floor at least one hour prior to its consideration. The Speaker, or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on any matter designated for consideration under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 275 is a straightforward resolution. The proposed rule merely provides that it shall be in order, any time today, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Committee on Rules agreed to an amendment offered by Mr. BEILENSON, which provides that the matters to be considered under suspension will be announced from the House floor at least 1 hour prior to consideration, and that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the minority leader or his designee on any suspension considered under this resolution. House Resolution 275 was reported out of the Committee on Rules by unanimous voice vote. Simply put, this resolution, will allow for a special suspension of the rules day for consideration of possible selective continuing resolutions to keep vital offices open.

By passing this resolution, we are attempting to speed up the legislative process so that we can reopen the Government as soon as possible while keeping our commitment to the American people to balance the Federal budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this rule come to the floor today.

This rule permits the majority to call up suspension measures with prop-

er notice. I assume they will use this to call up a targeted continuing resolution. I hope it will also be used to call up a governmentwide continuing resolution that the President will sign.

This rule means that Federal employees can finally get back to work; it means that the U.S. Government will be open for business again as it should be.

It is a good rule, it is a good idea, it is just a shame it took so long; the American people expect more from their Congress and they are right.

The 84,000 American seniors and workers should have been able to apply for Social Security and disability benefits; 600,000 American seniors should have gotten answers from the 1-800 Social Security help line; 23,000 American veterans should have been able to apply for benefits.

This should not have happened and I am glad President Clinton has taken steps to stop it.

Yesterday, by Executive order, President Clinton reopened Federal offices providing services to veterans, Social Security recipients, and Medicare recipients.

He made sure that this ridiculous Government shutdown did not hurt any more than it absolutely had to and today's rule will allow congressional Republicans to tell President Clinton he had a good idea.

Given the partisan rancor around here these days, it is nice to see we still agree on some things.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1015

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is such a silly situation, it is very difficult to know where to start. But let simply say that what this rule is going to do is to make it possible for the House leadership to bring up an additional continuing resolution today, and my understanding of what is going to happen is that that continuing resolution will allow three additional functions of Government to continue that are now closed down.

It will expand the ability of the Social Security Administration to meet and process its work, it will expand the ability of the folks running the Medicare Program to do the same thing; and it will expand the ability of the Veterans' Administration folks to do the same thing. There is nothing wrong with any of those three actions, and I would be surprised if we do not have a unanimous vote in support of them in the House.

But the problem is that those are not the only three functions which ought

to be released from their hostage situation. So when we get to the bill which this rule will allow to come forward, a bill which is going to be unamenable because it is on the Suspension Calendar, I will be asking to make a number of unanimous-consent requests to try to expand the number of Government functions which will be allowed to open.

I do not see, for instance, why Galaudet University, why that university for those kids, deaf kids, why they should be forced to close. But we have a letter indicating that they will if we do not let them out of the hostage box.

I do not see why we should not make certain that all research at the National Cancer Institute is allowed to proceed. I do not see why we should not make certain that the civilians can be brought back to work in the Pentagon so that all of the military checks can be provided on the 29th. There is some concern they will not be able to do that unless those civilian employees are brought back. I do not see why we should not open up our national parks so that American families who have spent a good deal of money on vacation plans do not have that money wasted because of this silly argument on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

So on the next bill that will be coming as a result of this rule, we will be trying to expand those functions of Government, or open up those functions of Government again. But I must say that I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question on the rule because I believe that what this rule ought to provide is for the continuation of another full blown CR which will allow all of the functions of Government to continue while the Congress and the President go to the table on the budget.

Again, I repeat, we have two separate problems here. We have a difference between the President and the majority in the Congress on what the outcome of those budget negotiations ought to be on the reconciliation bill that passed yesterday. The way to resolve that is to resolve it not to continue to talk about how you are going to resolve it, but simply go to the table and work out the disagreements. But the reason we need a continuing resolution is an entirely separate reason, and that is because this Congress has only passed at this point 4 of the 13 appropriation bills necessary to keep the Government open.

Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, has just asked me by telephone to ask the Congress to send down to the White House the Legislative appropriations bill and the Treasury-Postal bill. They will sign them. That will make 6 bills out of the 13 that will have crossed the congressional finish line. But we still have the Interior bill, the Foreign Operations bill, the Veterans-

HUD bill, the Defense bill, the District of Columbia bill, the Commerce-Justice-State, and the Labor-HHS bill that have not gotten through the congressional process.

The President is not holding those up. The Congress is. In most instances, it is because there is an argument between Republican Members in the House and Republican Members in the Senate, who control both bodies, about what the content of those bills ought to be.

So I would suggest the simple way is for us to simply defeat the previous question on the rule, go back and get another rule, go back and send to us another continuing resolution on the House floor so that we can open up all of Government so that we do not continue to look like a bunch of silly children who are trying to dictate what the other's negotiating position ought to be.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, all the comments the preceding speaker made over 5 minutes, I can summarize it in less than a sentence. That is, we could have avoided it all if the President of the United States would agree to balance the budget of this country in 7 years.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are in a hurry, but I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] say that in effect, all we are doing in this CR is to ratify what the President has already done. In fact, that is not the case. The President issued an Executive order, and I am particularly concerned in the area of the veterans, but all his Executive order did was to authorize the processing of new claims. He could not send out the checks, he argued.

We have checked with the Veterans' Administration. They argue that without this CR they cannot send out the veterans benefit checks. It is wrong for us to hold them hostage. It does not matter how much more should be done or what arguments we might make. This needs to be done on behalf of the veterans of this Nation.

It is in fact a legal dispute as to whether or not the President has the authority as a veterans entitlement to send those checks out without us doing a CR. That is a disputed point. Had I been the President, I would have opted in favor of the veteran and said, "Send those checks out, let's do it." In fact the Veterans' Administration has said, "No, we aren't going to do that without Congress authorizing it." Therefore, we have come back with this CR, which is very much needed for the veterans of our country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 second to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply respond to the previous speaker by saying nobody objects to opening those functions. You are going to see virtually every single one of us for the opening of those functions. We want you to open more of them. We want you to let all of the Government workers go. We do not want you to continue to hold any hostages.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I was responding to Mr. MOAKLEY's comment that the President has resolved the situation. He has not. This is necessary.

Mr. OBEY. But you said, Mr. Speaker, taking back my time, that we were continuing to try to hold these people hostage. We want you to let them go.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would say again that if veterans are being held hostage, it is not this Congress that is doing it. We have checked with legal experts who say this is a disputed point as to whether or not the President has the authority to order this as a veteran entitlement and have the checks go out on time. He has opted not to do that. We are, therefore, going to solve the problem with this CR so that there is no question those checks will go out in a timely manner.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I know that a lot of discussion has gone on in regards to balancing the budget. Everybody is for balancing the budget. Nobody is arguing that point. But what the American people really need to do is ask my colleagues on the other side, "Well, how are you balancing the budget?"

You are cutting Medicare by \$270 billion over 7 years. You are cutting student financial aid by almost \$10 billion over 7 years. You are cutting the Medicaid Program by \$182 billion over 7 years. And you are providing tax breaks to people who are earning over \$100,000; they are going to get a check back for \$8,000 and people who are making under \$30,000 will get a check back for \$127.

That is how you are balancing the budget.

I supported a balanced budget amendment that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] had offered. I had supported Mr. STENHOLM's balanced budget in 7 years. I also supported the Coalition substitute budget for a balance in 7 years. But there were no tax breaks in that proposal.

What the American people need to know beyond the glitz of a balanced

budget, for or against, is, "Well, how are you proposing to do it?"

I submit to the members of the American public that when you ask my colleagues on the other side, that is when you notice the questions and the responses will not be as loud as the rhetoric on "I support a balanced budget"——

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. Because what they are proposing to do is they are proposing to increase taxes on working people.

We have an earned income tax credit program where people who are the waiters and waitresses and the cooks and dishwashers who are working and struggling to stay off assistance are not going to have that earned income tax credit so that they can continue to stay working.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question about working people?

Mr. BALDACCI. No, I will not. Thank you very much.

As we talk about moving people off welfare to work, we are taking away the tools from people to go to work.

When you talk about educational opportunities for the young people, when you are talking about the future and the computers and cyberspace, you are cutting student financial aid. There are 30,000 students in my State alone that depend upon guaranteed student financial aid so that they can go——

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question on financial aid?

Mr. BALDACCI. No. But if the Speaker would tell the gentleman to stop interrupting me, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, could I have order in the House, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is correct. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Maine is entitled to be heard.

The gentleman from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, there are 30,000 young people in my State that their only opportunity is a college education. That is their only dream in the world, is to have that college education. But my colleagues on the other side are going to make it more difficult and more expensive for them to go to college.

□ 1030

It is not going to be 4 years to go to college, it is going to be 5 and 6 because they are going to have to work while they are in college. That is what we need to do. That is what we need to address."

So if the President of the United States is going to be blackmailed into supporting a continuing resolution that supports the scheme of balancing

the budget on the backs of working people, on the backs of seniors, in my State alone there are people who are struggling for their prescription drugs. The seniors in my State have to cut the prescription drugs up because they cannot afford to take it all at one time.

What we are doing is we are cutting Medicaid because in my State that provides for the prescription drug program. So when you are hearing people on this floor talking about a balanced budget, I support a balanced budget, but I do not support it the way the majority wants to accomplish it.

That is what the President of the United States have been talking about. It hurts the seniors. It hurts the children. It hurts the people who are struggling. That is what this fight is about. This is not about government as usual.

My colleagues on the other side are trying to roll back the environmental standards. They are trying to roll back the educational opportunities. And they are trying to roll back the standards in nursing homes to protect our seniors.

I would submit to you that the President and the majority on this side are trying to move forward. They are trying to go forward into the future in providing a bright future for all of our young people and all of our seniors because we are not any stronger at all unless we all move forward together. That is what this country was founded on, and those are the responsibilities that we assumed when we swore to the oath as we were new Members of Congress. To allegiance to the country of the United States of America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like the preceding speaker, he spoke for 5 minutes to go back to the microphone. I would be happy to yield him 5 seconds to say to the American people that he has a balanced budget plan that will balance the budget in 7 years without raising taxes on the American people.

I would also like the gentleman, on his own time, to come back up to the American people while he talks about the 30,000 young people in his State, what about the Federal debt on those young people, what about the deficit this country is facing, what about the \$30 million an hour that this Government spends more than it brings in, spends \$30 million more?

Let me ask the gentleman, what about the child born today who faces \$180,000 on their lifetime earnings just paying interest on the Federal debt? When is the gentleman going to help this country get out of this fiscal insanity? One-seventh of the Federal Government's budget goes to pay interest on the debt. So it is easy, very easy.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman going to yield to me?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Colorado has the time and can decide whether or not to yield.

Mr. BALDACCI. The gentleman wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Maine will suspend. The gentleman from Colorado has the time and does not choose to yield.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this discussion today on the House floor at this point in time is on the rule. The gentleman from Maine decided to utilize this time to go through a 5-minute problem of what we face in this country, but the biggest problem that the gentleman from Maine failed to refer to is the deficit that this country faces.

We have a lot of people, and, frankly, we have people on both sides of the aisle who are committed, committed, not as a goal but committed to balancing this budget in a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Maine rise?

Mr. BALDACCI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I had thought the gentleman had asked me questions and was going to provide 5 seconds for me to respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BALDACCI. My parliamentary inquiry is, if questions are posed to me, do I have an opportunity to respond to those?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has control of the time. If he chooses not to yield, he does not need to do so.

Mr. BALDACCI. Did you yield me time to respond?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few statements because I asked for time when someone else controlled it, and he was not willing to take on a couple of questions.

One of the preceding speakers talked about an antipathy, an animus toward letting the American people hang on to more of their hard-earned money. He did not degree with the notion of tax cuts. He said this new majority was cutting the earned income tax credit for working Americans, for those lower income Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as you know and as the facts reflect, the earned income tax credit funding increases by some 43 percent.

Then another speaker earlier said that this new majority was intent on cutting student loans. Mr. Speaker, the record reflects that the new majority is offering a \$6 billion increase over the next 7 years in the student loan program.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the rhetoric needs to square with the facts, and when we talk about working people, it is interesting that the President of the United States, in the State of the Union Message, stood at this podium and defined working Americans as those making under \$70,000 a year. I do not know by what barometer working Americans have to make \$70,000 a year or less. I find it very curious.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what is going on here. First of all, I would say to the prior speaker with regard to earned income tax credit, the earned income credit has been eliminated for families without children. Now, if you do not call that a cut for those folks, I do not know what you call a cut. So it has been eliminated, eliminated, done, finished, for families who do not have children. There is a cut in the earned income tax credit.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona says it is not a cut. Then how come in their budget they count money from the EITC toward balancing the budget? Is that Washington-speak reform?

Ms. DELAURO. Just one more sham.

Let me tell you what this is about. It is not about a balanced budget. That is not what the issue is about today. It is about holding the President of the United States hostage to a set of Republican budget assumptions which say that what we ought to do is to cut \$270 billion in Medicare, throw senior citizens in this country in disarray and provide devastating cuts, increase their premiums, and deny them their choice of doctors. That is what they want to do. They want to cut Medicaid, which allows nursing home coverage. That is one issue, one area that this is about, and holding the President hostage.

The President is right. The President is absolutely right in saying "no" to

\$270 billion in Medicare cuts, "no" to the slashing of education benefits for our young people.

I do not know how all of you got to school. I went to school with student loans. We are about to cut student loans and deny working middle-class families in this country the opportunity to send their kids to school.

They would like to hold the President hostage on those assumptions. The President has said "no" to that. He is right to do it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. DELAURO I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask a question, and you are talking about the tax cuts of \$270 billion. The gentleman here says that is not a tax cut. But it is strange to me.

What is strange to me under CBO scoring, if you do not get the \$270 billion cuts in Medicare, you cannot have the \$240 billion in tax cuts. So you have got to take it from somebody to give it to somebody else regardless of who you give it to. Whether they make \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year, it is a cut.

The bottom line is you are going to cut \$270 billion from the most vulnerable people in this country and you are going to give it away. If you were going to do that, why not put it to the deficit?

Ms. DELAURO. That is a tax break for the wealthiest Americans in this country. That is what this budget is about.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and before I yield time to my colleague down here, I would like to just say, after hearing the preceding speaker, it is kind of, and I will give an example, it is like going to your employer. Let us say you make \$5 an hour and you go to your employer and you say, "I would like a pay raise to \$10." Your employer says, "Well, I am going to raise you \$2. I am going to give a pay raise from \$5 to \$7 an hour." You say, "No. I want \$10." He says, "No. I am going to get you to 7." You go out to your other employee and you say, "Hey, hey, I got a pay cut of \$3 an hour."

We are not cutting Medicare. We are increasing Medicare. We are not cutting student loans. We are increasing student loans.

In regard to that, I will give you specific numbers. I will give you every reason in the book why this President should agree to balance the budget in this country within a 7-year period of time, why this President should agree to this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am listening to this debate, and I cannot stand it. I cannot

stand when I hear someone say we all want to balance the budget. If we all wanted to balance the budget, the budget would be balanced.

When Members say we all want to balance the budget and then talk about all the cuts they do not want and do not talk where they are willing to make reductions to slow the growth in spending or to cut programs we do not need, I cannot stand it.

We are, in fact, allowing this budget to grow. When I heard Members on that side say we are cutting EITC, the earned income tax credit, it is going from \$19 to \$25.5 billion. Only in this place when you spend more money do people call it a cut.

When they say we are cutting the school lunch program and it is going from \$6.3 to \$7.8 billion, that is an increase, not a cut.

When I hear people particularly say we are cutting the student loan program, it is going from \$24.4 to \$36 billion. It is growing 50 percent. The number of students in the next 5 years is growing from 6.7 million students to 8.4 million students.

Only in this place, in this town, when you spend 50 percent more, do they call it a cut.

Medicaid, it is \$89 billion today. It is growing to \$127 billion. In this town, that is a cut? Only here.

Then, in Medicare, it is going from \$178 to \$289 billion. That is not a cut. It does not even come close to being a cut. That is a significant increase.

Get a life.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially important because it seems to me that during this discussion that we should be holding on the rule, that instead we are having some speakers up here who are trying to scare the senior citizens, who are trying to scare students out there about their student loans, who are trying to scare the general population. I think the scariest thing we have got out there is this Federal deficit which is accumulating at a rate of \$30 million an hour.

I think the people in America are prepared to assist us in balancing this budget. I think the people in America understand that we are not cutting programs but that we are reducing the rate of growth there in programs.

I think the people of America want to preserve the economics of this country for the next generation and the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us get the Government working again. We are not holding the President hostage to tax cut or Medicare cuts. Everything is on the table right now. Everything is on the table.

Medicare is not being cut. It goes up 6.3 percent annually, every year, under this proposal, from \$4,800 a year per beneficiary to \$6,700 a year per beneficiary over a 7-year period.

But if you do not like our plan, let us see your plan to balance the budget. If you do not like the tax cuts, let us do it without the tax cut, but let us work together. Work to balance the budget in 7 years, and let us get the CBO to score it. It has been nonpartisan for years.

Let us send the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill up the President and get 100,000 more people working again. We can do this today. We can have these people back to work by Monday.

The District of Columbia Government should not be shut down because of our inability to get this signed by the President.

We ought to do something for them and get them back with their own money. We should not hold them hostage. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. Let us pass this rule. Let us move ahead.

□ 1045

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, my colleague from Virginia is right. There is a reason why we are in session today, and there is a reason why the Government is shut down, and it has a lot to do with the new majority that my freshman colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about.

Here are the facts. First of all, this Congress, controlled by the Republican majority in both Houses, has only passed 4 of 13 appropriations bills. Those are the bills that are supposed to be passed by October 1. Had those bills been passed, sent to the White House, and signed into law, almost 2 months ago, we would not be doing this today. We would not be talking about a shutdown of Government. Because this is how Government is shut down. They are funded through the appropriations bills.

Second, the Republicans are holding up the continuing resolution. In fact, the continuing resolution that was adopted by this House the other day that we hear so much about, to my knowledge, is still sitting in the Senate and has not even been sent to the President for him to either sign or veto as he should choose.

The fact is the reason why you cannot pass a clean CR is because you want to put a 7-year requirement. We can sit down, like my colleague from Virginia said, and talk about whether we want to get to a 7-year balanced budget. I voted for one. There are differences. But it has nothing to do with the CR. What it has to do with is the

bill that this House adopted yesterday, the reconciliation bill.

So why are you trying to put it in this bill when you have adopted another bill to do it? Is it because you are holding the Government hostage? Is it because it is either your way or no way?

Yes, that is what it is. It has nothing to do with appropriations. So you are muddling up an appropriations bill with what should be in a reconciliation bill. The facts are very, very clear.

Now, there is a bipartisan way to get there. Quite frankly, I do not think the new Republican majority wants to do it. They are in a bind. They are in a bind because they do not have the votes to pass their version. They do not want any other version. They want a version that cuts \$270 billion out of Medicare, \$140 out of Medicaid, and gives a \$245 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem and that is why we are here.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think the gentleman's inquiries deserve some type of response.

First of all, the question is why does the continuing resolution have such an onerous requirement that the President of the United States ought to commit to balancing the budget of the country within a 7-year period of time? I would suggest that the gentleman look at the TV commercial right now going on on at least five or eight different times. The President of this country has on each of those different occasions given a commitment, commitment, to the American people to balance the budget. The first time was when he was running for office, 5 years, then it went to 10 years, then back to 7 years, then to 8 years, and who knows what.

All we are asking for is a commitment in writing. Talk is cheap. The American people want a commitment in writing from us, which we just gave on the continuing resolution, and I say proudly it was bipartisan; 48 Democrats joined us in that. We gave our word in writing to this country we will balance the budget in 7 years.

I think it is fair, and I think it is appropriate, that we ask the President of the United States to give his commitment in writing that this country will have a budget balanced, not as a goal but as a commitment, within a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, briefly I would like to say that we have been doing our job here. We voted about 800 times last year; the entire Congress only voted 507 times. By trying to work with the President, we have been wasting our time, and that is why we have not been successful in getting our appropriations bills through.

We see the confusion of the American people when people talk about cuts in Medicare. When it goes from \$4,800 to \$6,700, that is not a cut. We are not balancing the budget on the backs of working people or senior citizens. That is what the Clinton tax burden did in 1993. It increased taxes on the working people through the gas tax and the poor. That is who pays the most for gas taxes. It increases taxes on Social Security. Mr. President did that.

But what we are trying to do here is relieve some of that burden. We are trying to reduce taxes on working people, on people with children, and we are also trying to preserve and protect Medicare. But the real fundamental issue here is can you balance the budget in 7 years.

We are tired of the dance. The music is playing. Let us dance to the music. The American public wants a balanced budget. I think this has been playing on for such a long time we are going to hear it over and over again. The real issue here is are you going to balance the budget in 7 years.

Now, there has been talk about a little leverage, play room, maybe not quite 7 years. For 26 years we have been hearing this about we cannot quite do it this time, we are going to have to do it some other way, we are going to have to wait awhile. The American people want us to draw a finite line, say we are going to balance the budget, and 7 years is an optimal time. It is the time when we can do it with the least amount of discomfort.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman complaining a while ago about the tax increases of 1993. Would you believe that none of those taxes are repealed in your tax bill this year. Not a single one. I do not know what you are bellyaching about.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what we are trying to do here is relieve people who have children, relieve seniors, trying to get them back to work, become actively involved. The President has failed to balance the budget in 7 years. He has even failed to agree to it. I support the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing roughly the same debate and good speeches now on both sides of the aisle for about 11 months. Where are we today, on a Saturday, about 45 days after we should have had a budget for the American people?

Well, we have the government shut down; we have hard working people throughout America that have saved all year long that are going on vacations, and the parks are closing; we

have people working hard in my district making the HMMWV, one of the best Jeep vehicles for the military, and because the defense contracting agencies are shut down, they may start to be laid off next week.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are sending us the message that it is time for us to open the government up and to sit down and negotiate, to negotiate, and not talk about Air Force One, and who played hearts for how long, or what person was told to get off what exit of Air Force One.

Mr. Speaker, let us get off of personalities and get on to negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], a Republican from Michigan, and I have language to try to get this government moving in the right direction again. We have 90 Republicans and Democrats that are trying to move forward on a CR that will give us some negotiating room to get this government open again in a bipartisan way.

If the leadership will not talk to each other, maybe it takes the grassroots here to get government moving in the right direction again. But I think the American people are losing their patience for a government and a Congress that will not work together to solve the Nation's biggest problem, and that is trying to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to begin to work together in a bipartisan way. If Mr. Rabin could have talked to Mr. Arafat one year ago, I think that Republicans and Democrats can talk to each other in Washington, DC.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, speech after speech today from the Democrat Party has one central theme: Not that of balancing the budget, but a theme of fear. Scare your grandmother, scare your child, scare your fellow Democrat; that if this fear mongering does not work, we will not be reelected.

Now, let us examine the low income housing credit which they claim to be champions of on behalf of the poor. What do they really use it for?

Now, Democrats, I want you all to watch this, because I think it might make you squirm a little bit in shame. Here is what you know you are doing on franked, taxpayer expenses. You send out this letter. And it says, and this is shocking to me, "Put some extra money in your pocket with the earned income tax credit. You may be eligible for as much as \$2,258 a year back. Come clean, your money."

Then it goes on, "Even if you do not owe income taxes, you can get EIC."

I want to ask you Democrats, how many of you do not do this? Raise your hand.

Very few hands go up on the Democratic side. That is very interesting to me, very interesting. And I appreciate the honesty of the fact that only three or four of you are not doing this.

I would like us to say if we do restore the earned income tax credit, I would love your side to take a pledge that you will not be sending out such a shameless flyer on taxpayer expense. If you would take this pledge not to abuse the franking privilege in this way—

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I guess I got your attention, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Are you saying every Democrat sent that out? I did not send it out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida will suspend. The gentleman from Georgia has the time. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, I asked the Democrats who were not doing this to raise their hands. Not many hands were raised.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend. The House will be in order. The House can conduct its business with better decorum than that. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend until the House is in order. The gentleman from North Carolina will suspend until the House is in order. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be glad to yield for a quick question to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Well, you know, sending out these flyers, what you have done, you have let the people who are going to get the big tax breaks sit in on the committee markups. Which is the worse?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question was simple. How many of you all do this at taxpayer expense, and how many of you will pledge to stop doing it? That is all my question is. I think this is an abuse of the franking privilege. You can read that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have already gone over it. But I say it is time we stop this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised not to conduct straw polls in the House.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO].

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, you know, I came here because I did not understand all this rhetoric that is going on. I still

do not understand it. For one, you hear about education, "the backs of education." The very truth of the matter is simple: Education in this country stinks. It is that simple. Now, I do not understand why we would pour more money at a lousy educational system and get the results that we are getting. But we are saying we are taking education away.

We are not. I cannot send my kids to a public school. It is so lousy, I would not dare abuse my children. So that is just a bunch of nonsense. Education, they had better reform it. So we are not doing anything on the backs of education.

Now, see, as an average guy, I would say, why did the President come up here and why did I sit here and hear him say "Let's use CBO numbers?"

□ 1100

Why did he say that? Has anyone said why he said that? Why did he say use CBO numbers? I do not understand. He said that. I guess the kindest thing to say is he was not telling the truth when he said that.

Look, my colleagues, here is the issue. We have to balance this budget. Otherwise, we hit a wall going 180 miles an hour. It is not as complicated as all this rhetoric that we hear by these expert politicians. It is we must balance the budget.

Now, if they wanted to balance the budget, they had 40 years to balance the budget. We are now confronting that issue. We cannot back down from that.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a report on time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office this morning watching the proceedings of the House, and it brought to mind a movie which I liked very much, called "Groundhog Day" with Bill Murray. Every time the clock radio went off in that movie, on would come the former speaker, Congressman BONO, singing "I Got You, Babe." No matter what morning came along, every morning the same song was playing on the clock radio.

That is what is going on on the House floor here. It strikes me that the political rhetoric in this debate is getting repetitive, tired, and sad. Members are getting short-tempered because we are making no progress whatsoever. The Republicans insist they are saving America. We Democrats think they are saving America. Speaker GINGRICH

thinks the idea of a 7-year balanced budget came to him in a dream. We think it could turn out to be an economic nightmare.

Frankly, what is in store for us here is to finally put aside some of this hot rhetoric, sit down, Democrats and Republicans, President and congressional leaders, and get this mess resolved.

Were we not sent to Washington to solve problems? I think we were. What we see here is a lot of pettiness, a lot of vitriol, and, frankly, very little progress.

The saddest part of it all is that there are some real victims in this political debate. Seven hundred thousand Federal employees as of Monday will still be on the streets without pay; 700,000 people being held hostage to this kind of political debate. That is outrageous.

It is nothing short of outrageous as well that while these people are on the streets without pay Members of Congress will still get their paychecks. How can we send these people home without pay while Members of Congress still get paid?

That is why I have introduced no budget, no pay. It says to Members of Congress, if we are serious about turning people out on the streets without a paycheck, cut off the machine that writes our paychecks. And Members know what will happen. We will not take this 48-hour adjournment recess the Republicans have proposed. We will stay here and do the job as we should. Get it done.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the gentleman there is nothing that prevents him from going ahead and doing the pilot project and not taking his check.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. No; I will not.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Colorado has the time, and he can choose whether or not to yield. He does not choose to yield.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the second thing I would ask the preceding speaker is to amend his bill so that it includes the President of the United States; and the third thing that I would mention to the previous speaker is he talks about 700,000 Federal employees, and my bet is that these people will, while they are furloughed, they will be paid for that period of time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will suspend. The Members are advised that the time used by the floor

manager in commenting on the substance of the debate is counted against his time.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. MCINNIS. Again, Mr. Speaker, to the previous speaker, the gentleman talks about 700,000 so-called hostages, Federal employees who will be paid while they are on this furlough, but he continually, every day that there is a speech by the gentleman, he continually fails to mention that 230 or 260 million people in this country are held hostage by the deficit, which is accumulating at \$30 million an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are really here to end the sham, the scam. If Members will recall when Bill Clinton, before he was President, I saw him with my own eyes. I have a little bit of nearsightedness, but I saw him, I heard him. I am not visually or hearing impaired, and I heard him. He was running for office, and he promised to balance, he would submit a plan to balance the budget in 5 years. We heard him.

Now, I am sure you have seen the recent commercial. We also have Bill Clinton saying, I think it can be done. Well, it can. First of all, it can be done in 7 years. That is May 1995. Then we heard 10 years, then we heard 9 years and 8 years. . . .

Mr. HOYER. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICA. We are going to nail down the balanced budget.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Under the rules, the gentleman cannot say any more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will be seated.

□ 1110

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would state for the RECORD that my words, in fact, were referring to the budget, and at no time would I refer to the President, and I ask unanimous consent that they be stricken.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman have been taken down. I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw his words?

Mr. MICA. Yes, I do, I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would gladly apologize.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is supposed to sit down until the words have been taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

We heard him now, I am sure you have seen the recent commercial. We also have Bill Clinton saying, I think it can be done. Well, it can be done, first of all it can be done in 7 years. That is May 1995. Then we heard him in 10 years, then we heard 9 years, and 8 years. Well, my colleagues, we are here to nail the little bugger down, and that is the purpose of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, there is an improper reference to the President of the United States and the remarks are not in order.

Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Without objection, the gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. HOYER. We will object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state it.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman from Florida's words are taken down, are not his privileges on the floor suspended for the day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The privilege of debate for the gentleman would be suspended unless the House permits the gentleman to proceed in order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House allow the gentleman to speak for the rest of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] to allow the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] to proceed in order.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 189, answered "present" 26, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 816]

YEAS—199

Allard	Fox	Mollinari
Archer	Frank (MA)	Moorhead
Armey	Franks (CT)	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Frisa	Norwood
Ballenger	Funderburk	Nussle
Barr	Gallely	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Ganske	Paxon
Barton	Gekas	Pombo
Bass	Gephardt	Porter
Bateman	Gilchrest	Portman
Bereuter	Gillmor	Quillen
Billbray	Gilman	Radanovich
Billrakis	Goodlatte	Ramstad
Bliley	Goss	Regula
Boehert	Graham	Riggs
Boehner	Greenwood	Roberts
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Rogers
Bono	Hall (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Hancock	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Royce
Bunn	Hastert	Salmon
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Sanford
Burton	Hayworth	Saxton
Buyer	Hefley	Scarborough
Callahan	Heineman	Schaefer
Calvert	Herger	Schiff
Canady	Hilleary	Seastrand
Chabot	Hoke	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Hostettler	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Houghton	Shaw
Christensen	Hunter	Shays
Chrysler	Hutchinson	Shuster
Clement	Hyde	Skeen
Clinger	Inglis	Smith (MI)
Coble	Istook	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Johnson (CT)	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)
Combest	Jones	Solomon
Cooley	Kasich	Souder
Costello	Kelly	Spence
Cox	Kim	Stearns
Crane	King	Stockman
Crapo	Kingston	Stump
Creameans	Klug	Talent
Cubin	Knollenberg	Tate
Cunningham	Kolbe	Tauzin
Deal	LaHood	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Largent	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Thornberry
Dickey	Laughlin	Tiahrt
Doggett	Lazio	Torkildsen
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Upton
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Vucanovich
Duncan	Lightfoot	Waldholtz
Dunn	Linder	Walker
Ehrlich	Lucas	Walsh
Emerson	Manzullo	Watt (NC)
English	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Ensign	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McHugh	Weller
Ewing	McInnis	White
Fawell	McIntosh	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Young (AK)
Flanagan	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Foley	Meyers	Zeliff
Forbes	Mica	
Fowler	Miller (FL)	

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Clay	Eshoo
Ackerman	Clayton	Evans
Andrews	Clyburn	Farr
Baesler	Coleman	Fattah
Baldacci	Collins (IL)	Fazio
Barcia	Collins (MI)	Filner
Becerra	Condit	Flake
Bellenson	Conyers	Foglietta
Bentsen	Coyne	Ford
Berman	Cramer	Frost
Bevill	Danner	Furse
Bishop	de la Garza	Gedjenson
Bonior	DeFazio	Geren
Borski	DeLauro	Gibbons
Boucher	Dellums	Gonzalez
Browder	Deutsch	Goodling
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Gordon
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Green
Brown (OH)	Dooley	Gunderson
Bryant (TX)	Doyle	Gutierrez
Camp	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Cardin	Edwards	Hamilton
Chapman	Engel	Harman

Hastings (FL)	Meek	Rush
Hefner	Menendez	Sabo
Hilliard	Mfume	Sanders
Hinchey	Miller (CA)	Sawyer
Hoekstra	Minge	Schroeder
Holden	Mink	Schumer
Horn	Moakley	Scott
Hoyer	Mollohan	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Montgomery	Sisisky
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Skaggs
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Skelton
Johnston	Myers	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Nadler	Spratt
Kaptur	Neal	Stark
Kennedy (MA)	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Stokes
Kennelly	Obey	Studds
Kildee	Oliver	Stupak
Klecza	Ortiz	Tanner
Klink	Orton	Taylor (MS)
LaFalce	Owens	Tejeda
Lantos	Pallone	Thompson
Levin	Pastor	Thornton
Lewis (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Thurman
Lincoln	Payne (VA)	Torres
Lipinski	Pelosi	Torricelli
Lofgren	Peterson (FL)	Towns
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Trafilant
Luther	Pickett	Velazquez
Maloney	Pomeroy	Vento
Manton	Poshard	Visclosky
Markey	Quinn	Ward
Martinez	Rahall	Waters
Mascara	Rangel	Williams
Matsui	Reed	Wise
McCarthy	Richardson	Woolsey
McHale	Rivers	Wyden
McKinney	Roemer	Wynn
McNulty	Roukema	Yates
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—26

Bachus	Franks (NJ)	Ney
Barrett (WI)	Frelinghuysen	Parker
Bartlett	Hobson	Petri
Blute	LaTourette	Pryce
Burr	Leach	Rohrabacher
Castle	LoBlondo	Wamp
Davis	Longley	Wicker
Dixon	Martini	Wolf
Ehlers	Morella	

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (LA)	Jefferson	Rose
Brewster	Livingston	Tucker
Dornan	McCrery	Volkmer
Flelds (LA)	McDermott	Waxman
Hayes	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Jacobs	Oxley	Wilson

□ 1136

Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HEFLEY, COSTELLO, and SHAYS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. PETRI, PARKER, WAMP, LONGLEY, LOBIONDO, FRELINGHUYSEN, NEY, and BARRETT of Wisconsin changed their vote from "yea" to "present."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] may proceed in order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, first I want to apologize for the inconvenience that I have caused the House. I did ask unanimous consent to have my remarks withdrawn.

I hold the House in great honor and really consider it a tremendous privilege to serve here. As Members know,

my family served on that side of the aisle. It is a great institution. I do nothing to shed any bad light on the House and apologize if any words that I, in fact, made were improper to each and every one of you personally, but I guess we get emotional in this.

I never went to law school and sometimes I come up here and say things I should not say. I probably should choose better words. But, like some of you, I missed my son's football game last night, I did not get a chance to get the house cleaned today with my wife for Thanksgiving.

You really think about the reason we are here is to balance our budget and to get our Government's finances in order.

I know everybody on this side wants to do that with compassion and care. That is the reason we are all here and to try and do a good job to get our country's finances in order and to be responsible as Representatives of the people.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, quite frankly my constituents do not quite understand why we are behaving the way we are today, when it is my constituents, when it is the Federal worker, when it is the taxpayer, when it is the person who needs Federal services that has the right to be outraged and to lose their patience from what we are not doing in this Chamber.

Let me bring us back to the rule that is before us that will permit us to have a continuing resolution so that our veterans, Social Security benefits, and Medicare can be processed. That is a reasonable request, a continuing resolution for those purposes.

My constituents are asking why can we not have a continuing resolution for the other agencies of Government? If it is simple enough under suspension of the rules to pass authority to spend money for veterans, Social Security, and Medicare, why can we not do it for all of the appropriations where this House has not sent to the President an appropriation bill?

My constituents are being inconvenienced not just on Social Security and veterans' checks but on their inability to get a passport processed, on their inability to have other Government services performed. They are outraged because our agencies are closed, we are telling Federal workers to stay home and be paid for the services that are not being performed, we are in fiscal crisis, and we are doing that?

If we can pass a continuing resolution without holding the President hostage on these areas, then why can we not come together and pass a continuing resolution on all of the agencies of Federal Government?

Do not bring up the balanced budget or other issues. Many of us support balancing the budget in 7 years. We can debate that on the budget. Not on a continuing resolution.

You are showing willingness for veterans, Social Security, and Medicare, then show a way to do it for all of our agencies.

Yes, let us support this, but let us bring up a continuing resolution for all Government services.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at this stage of the rule debate that we focus on what this debate is about, and that is the rule. I would like to just repeat that House Resolution 275 is a straightforward resolution. The proposed rule merely provides that it shall be in order at any time today for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Committee on Rules agreed to the amendment to the rule by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] which provides that the matters being considered under suspension will be announced from the House floor at least 1 hour prior to consideration and that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the majority leader or his designee prior to consideration under this resolution.

This resolution, this rule, was taken out of the Committee on Rules by unanimous vote. I think it is especially important that the remaining speakers focus on the issue of the rule.

□ 1145

By passing this resolution, we are attempting to speed up the process so we can reopen the Government as soon as possible while keeping the commitment to the American people to balance this budget within a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would focus on the rule, except for 10 seconds ago I had talked about the balanced budget, so I am going to have to do that. It is a good rule.

I think my colleagues on the other side would agree this is a good rule, and we ask for their support.

Without looking at any blame, why do we need? I think, instead, of the Washington Post says we need a goal for a balanced budget, that the President is looking for a goal. And why do we need it hard and fast, without blame on any side?

In the 1970's we were going to balance the budget. We were going to reduce spending for every tax dollar that comes in by 3. It was not done. Then in the 1980's they had a foolproof, they came up with a foolproof way to balance the budget. It was called Gramm-Rudman. Again, for every tax dollar

that came in, we were going to cut spending by 3, or at least reduce it. That was not enforceable.

Then the famous one, when George Bush moved his lips. We were all going to reduce spending. We did not there.

I think, my colleagues, when we try and reduce spending, those are called cuts.

You know, it does not serve any of us. We are trying to reduce, in a balanced way, to balance the budget. I think we need a hard, firm commitment out of this Congress because it is primarily with Congress that those come from, and with the President, that we need to balance the budget.

He said we could do it in 5. He also said we can do it in 7. And all we would like is a commitment to do it in 7.

I ask you to vote for the rule because I think it is a good rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let us talk about this rule. Why do we need a rule now today that allows them to waive everything, run everything through here without notice, no layover, no anything? Why? Because it is now 59 days after the fiscal year came and went, and you have all seen the charts of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Gingrich Republicans did not get their work done. We have heard a lot this week about airplane rides and why they did not get it done and who felt bad and what the President did.

But, basically it is very interesting to me that the reason we are 59 days and still have not gotten the work done is there is a huge disagreement between Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House. So I do not really care whether they got to talk to the President or not.

I am amazed that the Leader DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH can sit next to each other for 25 hours on a plane, they still did not get it worked out. We still have not got the charts filled.

So now we have to have this rule to run everything through. Everybody is trying to be obscure by saying we are for a balanced budget, no, we are, we want 7 years, no, 5 years, 10 years, the President.

Here is the Republican balanced budget. It is simple. They have got more weapons and half the special interests. That is what it was, big corporate tax cuts, big corporate welfare and more for defense than the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for.

You have got to pay for a balanced budget somehow. Many of us have already voted for a 7-year balanced budget. That is not really at issue. The issue is how you get to the balanced budget.

But that is not the issue today. The issue is how do you get the bills done?

How do you get the work product done? We have failed in doing our work. But what we have done is throw other people out of work that want to do their work.

There is something nuts about this, and I must say to the other side it does not look efficient, and I am ashamed we have to be here on this rule today.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in regards to the preceding speaker, it is her kind of math, frankly, we have gotten a problem with. It has been 49 days since the end of the fiscal year, not 59 days.

Second of all, Mr. speaker, I would like to finish my comments. The other comment I would like to make is, as I recall the previous Speaker's statements from earlier in the year, the criticism to this side of the aisle is we are going too fast, you are going too fast, slow it down. I think both sides of the aisle can work on this. Let us get it completed and get a commitment from the President to balance the budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Contrary to what many people may believe, this happens on occasion in our democracy where we come to an impasse. I think 7, 8, 9, 10 times since 1980 we have had debates about where to take the country. We have had to go past the end of the fiscal year.

This is probably the greatest debate I will ever engage in as a Member of Congress because the single issue is this: Is it not about time, American people, both Houses of Congress and the President joined together and commit to the principle of balancing the budget within 7 years, which is not too hard, which needs to be done?

Let me tell you why it needs to be done: We spent more money this year in interest payments than the entire Department of Defense budget. If we do not change our spending ways, in 17 years the entitlement portion of the budget and the interest portion of the budget will consume the entire revenue stream. If we do not do it now, when are we going to do it? Let some objective group, not Republicans or Democrats, look at the numbers. This can end in 30 seconds, not just for veterans and Social Security applicants but for the whole Nation. Let us end it right. Let us give the American people the best Christmas present they could ever have, and that is Congress and the President agree to get the Nation's financial house in order. Now is the time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, with today's continuing resolution, I am

glad the Republican leadership has finally recognized what Democrats have felt.

By this resolution, I am glad the Republican leadership has recognized what we felt all along, and that is that it is wrong to use veterans and Medicare recipients and social security recipients as hostages, as innocent victims in this budget debate.

It is not what is in this continuing resolution today that bothers me. It is what is not in this continuing resolution that bothers me. The resolution we will vote on today does not allow us to ensure that the paychecks of the American military personnel will go out on time on December 1. Let me repeat that: The continuing resolution today will not ensure that American military paychecks will go out on time on December 1. As we sit in this comfortable, heated room, there are thousands of American soldiers serving in the freezing cold of Korea, and under our continuing resolution today, those soldiers' families may not get their paychecks on December 1 and they may not be able to pay their rent and their utility bills.

My friends, that is unconscionable, and we should not allow it to happen. I am honored and privileged to represent 45,000 soldiers at Fort Hood in Texas. They are patriotic young men and women doing their duty, doing what we have asked them to do to serve their country, and it is unfair and wrong. Under this resolution, even if it passes, we cannot tell them eye to eye that they are going to get their paychecks on time.

There is nothing wrong with having an honest budget debate about whether we balance the budget in 7 years, 8 years, 9 years.

There is nothing wrong about having that debate. It is wrong not to pay our military personnel on time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman just in the well, I would like to report to him without any reference to Medicare, Medicaid, school lunches, tax increases, tax cuts, or anything else, the House and the Senate, in a strong bipartisan vote, have already passed the bill, the Defense appropriations bill, that would pay the salaries of the people in our military. All we need is a signature from the President, and that becomes law and they can go back to work and they can get paid.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this morning and we hear on the radio waves and in the newspapers people are sick and tired. They are tired of the quibbling. They are tired of the Government being shut down. They want us to do our business.

Let me just say to my colleagues and, through them, to the American people, yes, democracy is a messy business.

As George Will said the other day, there is no such tension, there is no such disagreement going on in Beijing and Havana, that none of us are envious of that. It is messy.

What we are doing is important because there is an underlying principle that is important here, and the underlying principle is a balanced budget.

As we have heard, this is a reasonable balanced budget. Medicare is up by 40 percent per individual over the next 7 years. Medicaid is up by nearly 50 percent; more student loans; the earned-income tax credit is up. If that is the case, what is this all about? It is about slowing the rate of government growth so we can just live within our means, and that will mean lower interest rates so everybody with a mortgage or a car loan or business loan can spend less money on that and have more money to spend and invest in their business and to spend on their family.

Yes, it is messy, but it is important, and we should balance the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply point out the gentleman from Florida is incorrect. The military pay raise cannot go into effect until the authorization level is passed, and that legislation is tied up between the two Houses. So the military personnel will not get their pay raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, do we all remember that game show, "Name That Tune"? I can name that tune in 10 notes, I can name that tune in 7 notes.

The American people think that is what we are doing here with this 7 years. I can balance that budget in 7 years, I can balance that budget in 5 years, I can balance that budget. The 7 years is arbitrary. A dozen Members on that side have told me the 7 years is arbitrary.

It is reported that, when asked publicly by the press how we arrived at 7 years, the Speaker of the House said it was our intuition.

This is not a game show. Name That Tune is not worth doubling the Medicare premiums on my senior citizens in Montana. Name That Tune is not worth cutting 600 little Montana kids out of Head Start. Name That Tune is not worth increasing the costs of college as much as \$9,000 to my Montana students.

No wonder the American people do not support this fight. They understand

that this thing was intuition. They understand that the 7 years is arbitrary.

What the American people support is moving toward a balanced budget in whatever number of years it takes to preserve the appropriate 50-year tradition of an equitable Federal partnership in their lives. There is no magic about 7 or 10. Let us get off of Name That Tune and start naming that balanced budget in a way that protects the American people as well as the American economy.

□ 1200

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, communications are very important in this discussion. We have got to remember communications, both now and after we finish with our work.

What I am talking about is the fact that we are spending so much time tearing away from tradition and tearing away from 30 years of practice and indulgence, spending that has been on in this Government to an excess. And, as we tear it away, we are also getting into a lot of arguments and discussions and so forth. But we have got to admit that the people who have been in control could give us more cooperation.

We have to admit that the information that we could get from the people who have been in authority for all these years would be very helpful. But right now they are not only not giving us that information, but they are causing us to have to withstand emotional arguments.

What I am pleading with you all to do is for us to keep the lines of communications going. We are going to make mistakes. In this environment we are going to make mistakes. We are trying to bring spending cuts to our country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, this is the first Saturday that the 104th Congress has been in session. Last year at this time Congress was home with their families preparing for the Thanksgiving holidays, praying for peace in Bosnia and the Middle East. We had adopted all 13 appropriations bills, we had passed the budget, and we created a \$500 billion deficit reduction package.

Look at this year. We have more days in session, more votes cast, and less done, than any time in recent history. The delay, the fight, is not necessary. Just in the beginning of October, this House passed a continuing resolution by a voice vote, so uncontroversial nobody even wanted to have to debate it.

You have the power, Mr. Speaker, you have the votes, Mr. Speaker, you have celebrated the expedience in which you could pass the Contract With America. You have made prom-

ises and less progress. You can bring the Federal workers back to their jobs and send Congress home to their families without any debate.

Pass a clean resolution. You have shown it could be done in October. It certainly should be done this late in November.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the rule, and I also rise today to say enough. It is time for this House and the White House to stop the partisan bickering that has brought this city and this Nation to crisis.

This week, how many lives were altered in ways that we will never begin to know? This week, for example, how many scientists were kept from their labs at NIH, kept from their research on AIDS, cancer research, breast cancer research, prostate cancer research?

All across this region and country Federal employees who want to work have been furloughed. Those who have been working have been struggling to keep their agencies afloat and thousands of taxpayers have been locked out of services they need and deserve. Federal employees, Federal contractors, and the American people have become pawns and hostages in a showdown that can and must be resolved.

The situation, frankly, has become intolerable, and, quite frankly, shameful. I would like to include a letter from the suburban Maryland High Technology Council outlining the adverse effects and impact, because frankly, I know there is common ground for agreement and for ending this crisis, and we will agree we must make sacrifices to balance the budget. We are willing to do it, and we can sit down to do it.

I want to remind the President and this body that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget is the former director of the Congressional Budget Office. So why can we not come together?

I urge this body to be involved with the White House in prompt action. It is time to stop toying with the lives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

SUBURBAN MARYLAND HIGH
TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL,
Rockville, MD, November 17, 1995.

Hon. CONSTANCE MORELLA,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MORELLA: The Suburban Maryland High Technology Council has polled its member technology firms concerning the affects and impacts of the current Federal Government shutdown on their day to day operations.

I have assembled and categorized some of the responses into the points below to let you know how this action is affecting them.

BUSINESS LOSS

Several companies mentioned that they are losing business:

- Unable to make sales.
- Unable to take orders.
- Cannot make deliveries.
- Cannot bill the government for services and equipment ordered.
- Delay on receiving payments from government agencies which affects cash flow.

Other companies comments:

- Delay in shipments of perishable medical products to government facilities.
- "Our firm handles government facilities and our business is definitely suffering."
- "Our orders are down 80% from NIH."

CONTRACTS

New contracts are not being issued or processed.

Contracts are being delayed.

AGENCY ACCESS

Difficulty in contacting the Commerce Department, therefore difficulties in conducting international business.

Limited access to information at Federal Communications Commission.

Cannot use NIH Library—day or night.

COMPANY EMPLOYEES

Employees assigned to government facilities have no work and will have to be laid off if the shutdown continues.

Had to find alternative work within the company for several contract employees deemed "non-essential" by the government.

Furloughed 12 people on one contract, (80% of the contract staff). They represent 10% of the companies employees.

Ten people had to be furloughed. That is a loss of income for these employees and they will not be paid as government employees expected to be.

Will continue to keep our employees even if we must borrow money and pay interest on it. This will affect our revenues.

OTHER

Federal Government shutdown sends the wrong message to the world about the prowess of the United States of America.

Not only are the many government employees in our area impacted negatively by the shutdown of the federal government but our many government contractors are also feeling the drain. Unfortunately, there will be no provisions for retroactive compensation for the losses these firms are experiencing. Maryland has a large share of the nation's government contractors. Lack of income, contracts, employee layoffs will have an immediate effect on these firms. Additionally the lack of indirect and induced revenues generated by these firms will have an affect on State's economy.

We urge you to work diligently and quickly to solve this detrimental shutdown of our federal government.

Sincerely,

DYAN BRASINGTON,
President.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would include for the RECORD an article by Eric Black of the Minneapolis-St. Paul Star Tribune. It is an explanation on the whole CBO-OMB controversy.

[Washington Times—Nov. 18, 1995]

'93 WORDS RETURN TO HAUNT CLINTON

(By Eric Black)

In four forgotten paragraphs of a 1993 speech, President Clinton delivered a devastating

astating critique of the position he is defending today.

The Republican congressional leadership has insisted that, as part of a stopgap funding bill, Mr. Clinton must accept a set of economic projections developed by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) as the common method of analyzing competing budget proposals.

Mr. Clinton insists on using more optimistic economic forecasts by his own Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a practice he derided in the 1993 speech, saying it provided both parties with "greater elbow room for irresponsibility."

In a joint session of Congress on Feb. 17, 1993, when he unveiled his first budget plan, Mr. Clinton made the following points:

Republicans and Democrats cannot have a clear debate about spending, taxing and deficit-reduction priorities unless they first agree on a common method for scoring the impact of their competing proposals on future deficits.

The CBO should be the source of that common method because it is "independent" and its estimates have been more conservative and more accurate than the OMB estimates, which often seemed to be tailored to the political needs of the president.

Mr. Clinton particularly wanted to avoid relying on more optimistic projections so that "no one could say I was estimating my way out of the difficulty."

The American people cannot follow the argument over spending priorities and will not "think we're shooting straight with them" unless the president and Congress agree on a common set of economic assumptions.

All four arguments are now being made by the Republican congressional leaders. Now, Mr. Clinton rejects the arguments that he made in 1993.

The Republicans are no models of consistency in this matter. When Mr. Clinton first boasted that his deficit projections were more credible because they were based on "the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office," the derisive laughter from the Republican side of the aisle was so loud it caused Mr. Clinton to depart from his text.

Then, of course, Congress had a Democratic majority and the CBO leaders were Democratic appointees. Speaker Newt Gingrich, who had often accused longtime CBO Director Robert Reischauer of pro-Democrat bias, insisted on changing CBO directors.

The argument over how to "score" budget proposals, while highly technical in nature, is also enormously important. To say what next year's federal deficit might be, even if all current policies were maintained, would require an accurate forecast of economic growth rate, unemployment, inflation, interest rates, wage trends, tax compliance and countless other figures.

If someone proposed a change, such as lower capital gains taxes or new HMO-type options for Medicare, the scorekeepers would have to estimate how many people would see long-held assets to take advantage of the lower tax rate, how many seniors would choose the HMO option and how much less it might cost the government to insure them that way.

Mr. Clinton was right in 1993 when he said that CBO projections had been more accurate than OMB projections during the Reagan and Bush years. The bad news is that even the more pessimistic CBO projections turned out to be overly optimistic for every one of those 12 years.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important, first of all, to remember that this rule came out of the Committee on Rules unanimously on a voice vote. There is no reason that we should not pass this rule here today.

Second of all, I think it is important we put it in its proper perspective. We think that it is especially important at this point in time in our history for the President of this country to go along with the U.S. Congress and commit to balancing the budget of this country in a seven-year period of time, using the CBO numbers.

We do not think that is too much to ask of the President, and the President should not think it is too much to ask of the Congress, and, frankly, the people of America are demanding we balance our budget.

The next thing I think is important to point out is at the beginning of this session when we are trying to change things, it has been 40 years, we were criticized for going too fast. Now, ironically, today we are being criticized for going too slow.

Finally, I would ask all the Members to keep in mind the President's budget that he submitted went down 99 to 0 in February. Not even one Democrat in the U.S. Senate supported that budget.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 169, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 817]

YEAS—247

Allard	Billakis	Calvert
Archer	Bliley	Camp
Armey	Blute	Canady
Bachus	Boehert	Castle
Baessler	Boehner	Chabot
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Chambliss
Ballenger	Bono	Chenoweth
Barr	Browder	Christensen
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Chrysler
Bartlett	Bryant (TN)	Clement
Barton	Bunn	Clinger
Bass	Bunning	Coble
Bateman	Burr	Coburn
Bereuter	Burton	Collins (GA)
Bevill	Buyer	Combest
Bilbray	Callahan	Condit

Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremins
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallely
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton

Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Hayworth
Orton
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard

Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traffant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—169

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)

Conyers
Coyne
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)

Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur

Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran

Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott

Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Baker (LA)
Brewster
Dornan
Fields (LA)
Hayes
Jacobs

McCrery
McDermott
Neumann
Oxley
Pryce
Tucker

Volkmer
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wilson

□ 1226

Mr. ENGEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. POSHARD, Ms. DANNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BROWDER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2491, 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-354) on the resolution (H. Res. 379) providing for the consideration of a Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 275, the Chair wishes to announce that today the Chair will entertain a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 123.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. McINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-355) on the resolution (H. Res. 280) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1230

CONCURRING IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 279 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 279

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or his designee to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is based on an inability to get an answer yesterday. Is the measure before the House the same measure which excludes the cost-of-living increases for military retirees for fiscal year 1996, 1997, and 1998, under the national security provisions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to the content of a measure that the resolution before the House would make in order.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order, Mr. Speaker, at a time when proponents and opponents of the

measure have time, to ask the proponents to yield to such a question? Would that be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be in order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILEN-SON], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for the consideration of a motion by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to concur in the Senate amendment to the Balanced Budget Act. This rule is made necessary by the fact that two small provisions of the Balanced Budget Act were stricken from the legislation as a result of the so-called Byrd rule.

Mr. Speaker, business as usual in Washington is making promises, not keeping them. Business as usual is talking about a balanced budget, but not passing one. Business as usual is higher taxes on families and more spending on Government.

By each of these three criteria, Mr. Speaker, passing the Balanced Budget Act today and sending it to the President is not business as usual.

Instead, this is a truly historic day in congressional history, the day when Congress agrees on a budget plan that places children and tomorrow ahead of politicians. That day is today. This rule will permit us to vote on a real plan, a specific plan that balances the budget in 7 years. It may not be perfect, but it has the support of a majority in the House and Senate. It has the support of those who want larger tax cuts, and those who would rather increase spending a little more. It has supporters who want to balance the budget more rapidly and those who think 7 years is as fast as possible.

Mr. Speaker, because it is a real plan rather than some phony outline, crafting the Balanced Budget Act involved real choices and very tough decisions. The conventional wisdom was that a final package could not be put together. The majorities in the House and Senate would self-destruct, many had said. That was obviously not the case.

Along with tremendous leadership from a number of people in and out of Congress, those who support this bill have come together behind a belief that it is a moral imperative that we put children ahead of politics as usual.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that balancing the budget is critical to improving standards of living. Lower interest rates from this bill alone are expected to create nearly 500,000 new jobs, private sector jobs in my State of California alone. Cutting the top rate on capital gains and extending the research tax credit will

translate directly into more jobs in the companies that are at the heart of my State's transition from a defense-based to an export-based economy.

Mr. Speaker, I know the experience of these new jobs to families in California. I will not apologize for cutting taxes to create more private sector jobs. These growth incentives will also increase wage levels, addressing the problem of stagnant wages that has plagued the economic recovery during the past 3 years. While we balance the Federal budget, we must be sure that clear priorities are addressed. Past Congresses have ignored the cost of failed immigration policies. Billions of dollars in services to illegal immigrants have been left to State taxpayers. That is wrong. For the first time this bill will create a \$3.5 billion Medicaid fund to assist States with the cost of emergency health care to illegal immigrants.

In tandem with the \$500 million appropriated by the House to reimburse States for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons, this targeted Medicaid fund places Congress at the forefront of dealing with this very important issue of illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the time to put partisanship aside. We must unite behind a fundamental desire of families all across this country. We know we must balance the Federal budget. They elected the President and Congress both to accomplish that goal. The President said he was going to do it in 5 years when he ran in 1992, and this Congress, this new majority in the Congress said we would do it. The Balanced Budget Act embodies a number of the President's election promises. Along with that balanced budget, he promised to end welfare as we know it. That is exactly what happens in this bill. He promised a middle-class tax cut when he ran in 1992; that is exactly what we are doing in this bill.

We should come together. This rule will permit us to send a balanced budget to the President for the first time in three decades. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILEN-SON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad my friend has stopped talking so we can come together.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows for a motion to dispose of the Senate amendment to the budget reconciliation bill, and allows for 1 hour of debate on that motion. The Senate amendment consists of the reconciliation bill we did yesterday minus two items as the gentleman explained that were dropped in the other body yesterday afternoon. It waives all points of order against the motion.

The rule we are considering is a perfectly acceptable rule for an, unfortu-

nately, unacceptable bill. Since the President has already said he will veto this bill, and we think he should, we think we ought to debate it quickly and get it to his desk as quickly as possible.

We do this body no justice by spending hours debating a bill that is sure to be vetoed. We believe we should concentrate our energies on working out a continuing resolution and a reconciliation bill that the President will sign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Appleton, WI [Mr. ROTH], my friend.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of short observations. Basically, when we hear debate that has been going on, not only this past couple of hours, but also yesterday and for the last number of days, it is basically the debate on this side of the aisle. As I see it, it is the debate about the old paradigm, the old liberal welfare state. If my colleagues analyze the debate basically coming from this side of the aisle, it is in the paradigm is that we are moving into an opportunity society.

Basically, what we are saying when we analyze it, is that the liberal welfare State is dead, that more and more government, more and more regulations are not the answer. What we are looking for in our society is that we are looking for less government, less regulation. Why? Because the jobs that are coming are not going to be produced by Government. The jobs that are coming are jobs that are being produced by entrepreneurs, and entrepreneurs cannot have a lot of regulation.

The world is moving ahead too fast. We have got to have less government so that the private sector can move and create the jobs that are needed today. So basically what we are debating here is really a very philosophical issue of where the country and where the world is heading.

We are saying basically that the liberal welfare state is dead and that it is being replaced by the Information Act, what we call the opportunity society.

That is why it is difficult to get these groups basically to see eye to eye. But the American people instinctively know that we cannot continue the liberal welfare state. That is basically why everyone is so much in favor of a balanced budget. It is not only the dollars that are involved, but it is the direction that our country is going in.

When we have our town hall meetings, people are always talking about let us balance the budget. Let us do what the American people are demanding. The American people are demanding a balanced budget. Basically what the American people really are saying

is that our Government has gotten too big and our government costs too much.

□ 1245

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an aye vote on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair or until approximately 1:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1329

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EMERSON] at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 440, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of both the majority and the minority, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 440) to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes, be considered as agreed to.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 15, 1995, at page H12459.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the gentleman's request.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to take this opportunity to thank all of the conferees, particularly my good friend from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, my distinguished colleague and friend from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, and all of our committee members for their long, hard work on this important legislation. All have worked hard to make the necessary compromises to move this critical legislation forward on a bipartisan basis. The result of all of our efforts is a better conference report.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the conference report that we consider today des-

ignates the National Highway System, or NHS. The NHS is the backbone of our Nation's transportation system. It consists of 161,000 miles of Interstate highways and other heavily traveled roads. Although the NHS comprises only four percent of our Nation's total highway mileage, 9 out of 10 Americans live within 5 miles of an NHS road and it carries 40 percent of all highway travel and 75 percent of all trucking commerce.

With passage of this conference report and designation of the NHS, \$5.4 billion of critical transportation funds will now be released to the States. In the next fiscal year, an additional \$6.5 billion of NHS funds will be distributed nationwide. At a time when our infrastructure is crumbling, this legislation provides critical funds for badly needed transportation projects.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report also includes several other important changes to the landmark Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and other transportation laws. It provides additional funding through rescissions to address the section 1003 budget problem, authorizes funds for the National Driver Register and the National Recreational Trails programs, and withholds funds from States that do not prohibit underage drinking and driving by adopting a zero-tolerance law.

While this Conference Report does take these positive steps and others, I nevertheless have grave reservations about several controversial anti-safety provisions also included in the legislation. These provisions eliminate important Federal safety standards, including speed limits and motorcycle helmet requirements.

I know that in the 104th Congress there is a strong desire to turn safety responsibilities over to the States; however, our highway system is a national system. The highways we fund for the National Highway System are widely used by drivers who do not live in the State in which the highway is located. We at the national level bear a substantial responsibility for what happens on America's highways. We impose the taxes that fund the construction of these highways and we set the conditions under which the National Highway System is constructed and operated. We should not step away from our responsibility of ensuring that those very same highways are safe.

Unfortunately the conference has decided to eliminate important Federal safety standards which have saved hundreds of thousands of lives.

Regrettably, the conference report repeals the national speed limit which the National Academy of Sciences estimates has saved 40,000 to 80,000 lives in the past two decades.

The conference report allows States to have no speed limit at all, if they so choose. In fact, in nine States the speed limit repealer will automatically result in higher speed limits, increasing in some States to 70 miles per hour, in others to 75, and in one State to no speed limit at all.

Although today's cars are much safer than those of 20 years ago, it is people, and not cars, who cause accidents, and no matter what is said, speed kills. Speed is already a contributing factor in one-third of all fatal high-

way crashes, killing about 1,000 Americans every month and costing the Nation a staggering \$24 billion each year. This speed limit repealer will result in more Americans killed and taxpayer dollars wasted. The Department of Transportation estimates that the speed limit repeal included in this conference agreement will kill an additional 6,400 Americans each year, at an additional cost of nearly \$20 billion annually.

This legislation also terminates an important safety program which encourages States to enact motorcycle helmet laws. Again, the data show that, without question, motorcycle helmets help prevent deaths and serious head injuries. Head injuries are the leading cause of death in motorcycle crashes, and an unhelmeted rider is 40 percent more likely to incur a fatal head injury than one who wears a helmet, and more than 80 percent of all motorcycle crashes result in injury or death to riders.

When 27 States previously repealed or weakened their helmet laws, the increase in motorcycle fatalities was four times the increased rate of motorcycle registrations. Those States that have helmet laws show 20 to 40 percent lower fatality rates than States that do not have helmet laws. That 20 to 40 percent lower fatality rate means that, in those States without helmet laws, we could have saved 350 to 700 lives. I strongly support continuation of a Federal law which can save that many lives.

I cannot accept the argument that if you wear a helmet, the helmet is likely to contribute to an accident. In 900 motorcycle accidents investigated in the city of Los Angeles, 40 percent of the riders were helmeted; in none of these cases did the helmet contribute to the accident by restricting the hearing or vision of the rider.

Helmets reduce injury severity; they reduce the likelihood of death. When you are pitched from a motorcycle or from a bicycle, the probability is that your head goes down first. I know; I have had an accident riding a bicycle. A car pulling illegally from a curb and headed in the wrong direction came toward my bike, smacked me at 20 miles an hour. I went right into the windshield of the automobile and shattered the windshield with my head, but I was wearing a helmet. It not only saved my life but saved me from severe, possibly disabling injury.

I think everybody who rides a motorcycle or a bicycle ought to, in the name of common sense, wear a helmet. More so, in the name of all those who love them, all those who are in their family, all those who are in their community, and all those who are going to pay the bills if they wind up a permanent disabled case.

I am also deeply concerned with those provisions of the conference report which depart from uniform commercial motor vehicle and driver safety standards by waiving key safety regulations for several groups. Under the conference report, weekly on-duty time limits are waived for drivers who transport water well drilling rigs, transport construction materials and equipment, operate utility service vehicles, or deliver home heating oil, the latter being a provision which was not in either bill. In addition, under the conference report, no maximum driving or on-duty time limits would apply

to drivers who transport agricultural commodities or farm supplies during planting and harvesting seasons. Many snowplow operators would be exempt from the requirement to obtain a commercial driver's license for operating vehicles that weigh more than 26,000 pounds.

The conference report also creates a program encouraging DOT to waive additional safety regulations for commercial vehicles weighing less than 26,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, we need uniform safety standards, not waivers for special interests. This report opens floodgates that will not be easily closed. As soon as one group gets an exemption, other groups will argue that they should have similar exemptions.

Moreover, these waivers are a significant departure from the long-term effort to create uniform commercial motor vehicle and driver safety regulations. The public cares little about whether a truck transports agricultural supplies or home heating oil or any other commodity, intrastate or interstate. The public has consistently indicated that as far as they are concerned, a truck is a truck and all trucks should operate safely.

In addition, an administrative process already exists whereby DOT, the agency we created to ensure safety, may waive regulations, if such a waiver would be consistent with safety. The fact is that the groups that requested the waivers in the conference report could not convince DOT that they would be safe. That's why they came to Congress.

Finally, DOT is currently in the midst of millions of dollars of research on the very complex topic of driver fatigue. The bulk of the research will be complete by 1996. We should not grant blanket statutory waivers without considering the results of these studies.

Mr. Speaker, again, these provisions will seriously threaten our Nation's highway safety. While I endorse the conference report overall, there are numerous antisafety provisions in it which I cannot and will not support.

In that regard, I do want to call attention to a provision of this legislation which I developed to ensure that we will have the ability to oversee the effects of the safety cutbacks. Under my amendment, the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with any State that raises its speed limit, will study the costs to the State of death and injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes, and the benefits, if any, associated with the repeal of the national speed limit.

The Secretary's report will include information on the costs of motor vehicle crashes both before and after any change in the speed limit. It will determine whether these crashes are caused by excess speed, the use of alcohol, or other safety factors, and whether seat belts and motorcycle helmets were used by those involved in the crashes. In this way, within 2 years, we can review what we've done. I hope that my fears of growing numbers of highway fatalities and injuries are unfounded. If they are not—and this study will address this—we can revisit these issues and make the changes needed to save American lives.

Again, although I am seriously troubled by the antisafety provisions of this legislation, I believe that this legislation to develop America's highways should go forward. I will vote in support of the conference report.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 is one of the most important pieces of legislation in the 104th Congress. This legislation will directly affect the lives of generations of Americans to come.

The NHS is the centerpiece of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 [ISTEA]. It will be to the 21st century what the interstate was to the 20th century: The backbone of our Nation's transportation system and the surface upon which goods and services are carried safely and efficiently across our country.

I would like to thank all the House and Senate Conferees for their efforts to bring this conference report to resolution. Special thanks go to TIM PETRI, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee chairman, JIM OBERSTAR, the committee's ranking Republican member, and NICK RAHALL, the ranking Republican member on the subcommittee, for their contributions. I would also like to thank my Senate colleagues, especially Senator WARNER, Senator CHAFFEE, and Senator BAUCUS for their tireless efforts to produce this conference report.

I want to also commend the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration, especially Administrator Rodney Slater, for their excellent work in working with the States and proposing the NHS map we approve today.

This conference report is the result of a total bipartisan effort. The conference report is truly a compromise. There are provisions that I do not support, but in the spirit of compromise and to ensure the passage of the conference report I accepted these provisions.

The NHS bill passed the House by an overwhelming 419 to 7 vote on September 21.

The passage of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 will release \$5.7 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$6.5 billion in fiscal year 1997 in national highway system and interstate maintenance funds to the States. It is important to emphasize that this money is not from any new taxes. This \$12.2 billion is money already authorized from the highway trust fund.

The conference report will approve 160,955 miles on the National Highway System. These miles were identified through a comprehensive and cooperative process between States, localities, and the Secretary.

The NHS, made up of the Interstate System and the other most important highways in the country, is the backbone of the Nation's transportation system. While comprising only 4.1 percent of the Nation's total highway mileage, it will carry 40 percent of all highway travel, 75 percent of all trucking commerce, and 80 percent of all tourist travel.

America's reliance on its highways is at an all time high. The vast majority of personal trips are over highways. Seventy-eight percent of the value of all freight is transported by trucks over its roads. Over 75 percent of all the cities and towns in America rely exclusively on trucks for freight delivery.

The NHS will extend the benefits of the Interstate System to areas of the United States not currently served by interstate highways. Overall, the NHS will carry 42 percent of rural and 40 percent of all urban travel miles. Ninety-five of all U.S. businesses and

90 percent of all U.S. households will be located within 5 miles of an NHS route. While the Interstate System serves many urban areas with populations over 50,000 and most State capitals, the NHS will serve them all.

Let me review some of the highlights of the bill.

After enactment of this bill, modifications to the NHS will be made by the Secretary and the States. Intermodal connectors will be subject to a one-time congressional approval; however, those that meet FHWA criteria will be eligible for NHS funds in the interim period prior to congressional approval.

The NHS conference report also addresses the budget shortfall as a result of the application of 1003(C) of ISTEA. The conference report provides \$513 million in funding to the States from rescissions of budget authority previously made available. These funds are distributed to all States based on the ISTEA formula. In addition, the conference report provides States with additional flexibility to access unobligated balances in order to move forward on their highest surface transportation priorities.

The conference report contains several provisions that provide the States relief from burdensome Federal mandates and penalties. The national maximum speed limit, crumb rubber use requirements and penalties, metric signage requirements, motorcycle helmet law requirements and penalties are repealed, and management systems requirements and penalties are suspended.

I voted against the repeal of the national maximum speed limit, but, both the House and Senate voted overwhelmingly to repeal the national maximum speed limit. However, I am pleased that the conference report modifies the provision by allowing for a 10-day grace period after enactment, before the Federal repeal takes effect. During this period, State legislatures that are in session on the date of enactment may take action to set appropriate speed limits for their States. In States where the legislature is not in session on the date of enactment, a Governor may extend the effective date of the repeal until 60 days after such time as the legislature has convened so that the State has sufficient time to consider the appropriate speed limits for its State. I trust that State legislatures will act thoughtfully and deliberately and make the right decision for their States; taking into consideration the demographics, landscape, and road design of their individual States.

The conference report provides new authority for States and the FHWA to build new partnerships with the private sector through innovative financing mechanisms. These include: Establishment of a 10-State pilot project for State infrastructure banks; modifications to the advance construction program to permit use of advance construction beyond the authorization period; eligibility of Federal funds for preventive maintenance activities; expansion of use of Federal funds for bond or debt financing costs; use of donated materials or services towards the non-Federal share; expansion of the toll loan program to projects with a dedicated revenue source; and increasing the Federal share of toll projects.

The conference report contains no new projects. Some previously authorized projects

are corrected or redefined to permit States to use existing funds for revised priorities.

The conference report clarifies that in designating scenic byways, States may exclude from such designations segments of highway that are inconsistent with the State's criteria for designating scenic byways and may permit the erection of new billboards on those segments.

Scenic byways are State programs. It is appropriate that a State make the decision as to whether certain segments that are not consistent with its criteria should be excluded from its scenic byways designations, not the Federal Government. The authority of the FHWA is limited to determining whether the segmentation has a reasonable basis and that the State's action is not solely intended to evade Federal requirements.

The conference report contains a provision that allows signs, displays, and devices identifying and announcing free motorist aid call boxes and their sponsorship signs to be located on the call box and the call box post, in rights-of-way of NHS roads.

A FHWA memorandum dated November 14, 1995 states:

There is no relationship between sections 131(f) and (i) and the proposed section 111(c) because the call box signs are a very specific type of informational sign created in a section of title 23 completely separate from the Highway Beautification Act. Statutory construction would require the FHWA to treat the call box signs created under section 111 as entirely separate from any provision of section 131. Thus, the new category of signs cannot be affected by the Highway Beautification Act or by FHWA's Highway Beautification Act regulations.

The conference report provides relief to States from the Clean Air Act's enhanced inspection and maintenance program and transportation conformity requirements.

I would like to recognize the efforts of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association in bringing the suit to address the conformity issue, the settlement of which will be ultimately accomplished in this conference report.

The conference report contains a safety provision to help deter drunk driving among minors. States are encouraged to enact laws which make the operation of a motor vehicle by an individual under the age of 21 who has a blood alcohol concentration of 0.02 percent or greater considered to be driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated, or risk loss of Federal-aid highway funds. This provision will help protect our youth, make our highways safer, and reduce fatalities.

The conference report provides for common sense motor carrier deregulation through establishment of a Commercial Motor Vehicle Regulatory Relief and Safety Pilot Program and exemptions from burdensome regulations on certain motor carriers.

The Small Delivery Truck Pilot Program has been significantly tightened since the passage by the House. The Secretary has been given greater latitude to set criteria for entry into the program, the carriers participating in the program must only use top drivers, the ability to terminate carriers participating in the program has been strengthened and the Secretary may set interim criteria for operating the program.

These changes have been put into place after working with the Department, industry, safety groups, and consumer advocates. All sides have had a voice in crafting this provision.

The motor carrier hours of service exemptions for water well drillers, farmers, and construction and utility vehicles have been limited and the conference report has clarified that the States may continue to regulate intrastate commerce in these areas even more stringently than Federal requirements.

The conference report contains a provision to repeal the preemployment alcohol-testing requirement for all modes of transportation. Nothing in this provision is intended to limit the flexibility provided in the Federal motor carrier safety regulations that allow motor carriers to rely on postaccident drug or alcohol tests conducted by Government officials and obtained by the employer as a way to meet the motor carriers' testing requirement.

The Natcher Bridge, spanning the Ohio River between Owensboro, KY, and Indiana is a critical transportation project to the Second District of Kentucky. This bridge has been funded through appropriations and is not partially complete. It currently has approaches and piers but no roadway or structure. Completing this bridge is a priority.

This conference report makes \$5.7 billion in fiscal year 1996 funds and \$6.5 billion in fiscal year 1997 funds available to the States. It also provides additional allocations from rescissions and funding flexibility for States to fund high priority projects. For Kentucky, the bill makes \$51.0 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$58.2 million in fiscal year 1997 NHS funds available to Kentucky. Since the bridge is on the NHS, Kentucky may use all of these funds to complete the bridge.

This conference report also rescinds \$513 million in highway program funds that are no longer viable or in priority programs. Kentucky will receive a distribution of \$7.9 million from these funds, which may be used for any high-priority project such as the Natcher Bridge.

Finally, to permit States to fund high-priority projects despite a budget cut of 13 percent this year due to an obscure provision of law known as section 1003, this conference report provides flexibility to the States to reprogram old, unobligated balances of accrued funds. Kentucky can reprogram \$27.4 million, all of which could be used on the bridge.

I would like to work with the gentleman from Kentucky over the next 2 years to ensure that high priority projects such as the Natcher Bridge are considered whenever Congress considers highway funding, including the reauthorization of ISTEA.

Lock and dam #4 is a critical transportation project in my district that requires \$4 million in funding to complete the bridge. This conference report provides the State of Arkansas with \$7 million total in additional funding from rescissions. These funds are on top of Arkansas' regular Federal highway funding. Arkansas may use the funds to complete any high priority project in the State, including completing lock and dam #4.

The 1994 Northridge, CA earthquake was centered in the 25th Congressional District and highlighted the transportation shortfalls evident in several communities in north Los

Angeles County. Other than Northridge itself, the community which probably suffered the most was the city of Santa Clarita, which was flooded with traffic following the destruction of the freeway interchange between I-5 and State route 14. I understand that even in normal circumstances, existing highways in Santa Clarita are overcrowded since the system of roads currently in place was designed over 30 years ago. Since that time, Santa Clarita has been among the fastest growing cities in California and a major traffic problem in the area.

I hope that in the future, we may look to address two transportation needs in the area that have been brought to my attention, the interchanges around I-5 and Route 126. Both of these routes are on the NHS and if these two interchanges and adjacent roadways require major improvements and I hope to work with the gentleman from California to help him address these needs.

At this time, I would like to recognize a leader in the highway community for over 40 years, Les Lamm, who passed away on November 1. Les Lamm was elected president of the Highway Users Federation on March 1, 1986 and served in that capacity until January 15, 1995. Les was counselor to the president of the Highway Users Federation until his death. A civil engineering graduate of Norwich University in Vermont, he completed postgraduate studies at Harvard University, MIT, and the University of Maryland. Les came to the federation after a 31-year career with FHWA, and its forerunner, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. In 1973, he became FHWA's executive Director, the Agency's top career professional. In 1982, President Reagan appointed Mr. Lamm FHWA Deputy Administrator. Between 1973 and 1986, he worked with six U.S. Secretaries of Transportation, helping direct more than \$100 billion in Federal aid to highway programs.

Les was an incorporator of the Intelligent Vehicle-Highway Society of America and served as its president.

He was a noted authority on highway transportation, and was a member of the board of governors of the International Public Works Federation; a member of the executive committee of the Transportation Research Board; a director of the International Road Federation; a director of the National Commission Against Drunk Driving; a director of the Travel Industry Association of America; a director of the Road Information Program; on the advisory board of the Northwestern University Traffic Institute; president of the Alumni Association of Norwich University; and was active in many other transportation-related professional organizations. He has received more than 50 awards for professional excellence from a wide range of private and public sector organizations.

We will all miss this fine gentleman. It is appropriate that we honor him today, for he would have been very proud to see the National Highway System, one of his greatest legacies, enacted into law.

I want to thank the superb staff on the Surface Transportation Subcommittee. They worked with great diligence and dedication to help produce this conference report. They are: Jack Schenendorf, Bob Bergman, Becky Weber, Roger Nober, Debbie Gebhardt, Peter

Loughlin, Aadam Tsao and Linda Scott on the majority side, and David Heymsfeld, Sante Esposito, Ken House, Rosalyn Millman, Ward McCarragher, Dara Schlieker and Jim Zoia on the minority side.

I am pleased to bring this critical legislation to the House for approval and then promptly send it to the President for his signature. I urge all my colleagues to give them their full fledged support to this historic legislation.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this conference report to accompany S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. I want to acknowledge the efforts and contributions of all the House and Senate conferees, as well as the critical assistance of Rodney Slater, the Federal Highway administrator, who was ready at all hours of the day to meet and give his advice and counsel as the conferees worked on this conference report these past several weeks.

S. 440 will designate 160,000 miles of our Nation's most important roads as the National Highway System. A dedicated source of Federal funds, authorized at \$3.6 billion annually, is reserved for these roads. In addition, approval of this conference report will lead to the release of over \$6 billion in National Highway System and Interstate maintenance funds which have been withheld from the States since October 1 of this year.

S. 440 also sets up a process for the designation and approval of intermodal connectors—roads connecting the NHS to ports, airports, rail yards and the like. Until these connectors can be initially approved by the Congress, interim eligibility provisions are included. The interim eligibility provision refers to a project to construct an intermodal connector. The definition of the word construct is already defined very broadly in title 23. It is our intention that the word construct in this section is to be read very broadly to include not only construction and reconstruction projects, but also projects involving resurfacing. Restoration, rehabilitation, and operational improvements, such as the installation of traffic surveillance and control equipment and computerized signal systems.

This conference report accomplishes much more than the designation of the National Highway System. Various Federal mandates and penalties are repealed, including the repeal of motorcycle helmet mandates and associated penalties, the repeal of the national maximum speed limit and associated penalties, and the repeal of the mandated use of crumb rubber in asphalt and associated penalties.

The conference report contains many other worthy provisions to improve our Nation's Federal highway program and to facilitate the construction of transportation projects across the country. The conference report, like the House bill which was passed in September, does not contain any new funding for any specific highway project.

Although I am generally pleased with this conference report, there is one major disappointment. The Senate refused to agree to the House provision which would have utilized over \$500 million in excess and available budget authority in the minimum allocation program to restore funding reductions that every State will experience as a result of section 1003 of ISTEA.

Unfortunately, the Senate chose to offer up this budget authority as savings for the purposes of budget reconciliation. I believe the decision of the House to utilize this budget authority in a way that would not increase the deficit but would have benefited the highway program was a better course to take. I regret the Senate did not agree.

Nevertheless, this conference report is worthy of the support of every member of the house and I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report and approve the National Highway System.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. This bill designates approximately 161,000 miles of highways in the United States as components of the National Highway System [NHS] and includes \$6.5 billion for States to use for Federal highways. Under the bill's formula, Florida would receive approximately \$234 million a year.

I want to thank Congressman RAHALL, Chairman SHUSTER, Congressman OBERSTAR, Congressman PETRI, as well as former Chairman Norman Mineta for helping us to find Federal funds to replace Jacksonville's Fuller Warren Bridge. These funds will be combined with State and local funds—this is truly a Federal-State partnership.

As many of my colleagues may know, I have been working on this project for 3 years. The need to replace the Fuller Warren Bridge has been recognized by local, State, and Federal transportation officials because its structural deficiencies have resulted in very serious safety and traffic congestion problems for a transportation edifice that is the gateway to our Nation's third largest State.

Built in 1954, the Fuller Warren Bridge is functionally obsolete, its lane widths are insufficient, and it lacks safety shoulders. Consequently, Florida's Department of Transportation has identified this segment of I-95 to be a high accident location. In the past five years, 604 accidents have occurred along this segment resulting in economic losses exceeding \$16 million. Accidents occur frequently due to the sudden narrowing of I-95 from a six- to eight-lane roadway to a four-lane bridge. In addition, the bridge's serious structural deficiencies in the last few years led to the bridge being closed for 6 days in January 1992 when engineers found cracks in the counterweights. In 1993, the bridge was closed again when a 3-foot chunk of the bridge's roadway fell into the St. Johns River.

The new bridge will improve the substantial traffic congestion that exists for the traveling public strictly because of the existing Bridge's structural deficiencies. The severe traffic congestion caused by the Fuller Warren bridge is well known to both local and interstate travelers. Each bridge opening lasts approximately 5 minutes or more. These delays create significant problems that affect traffic flow long after the bridge reopens. These bridge openings lower the capacity and the level of traffic service on Interstate 95.

In addition to the frequent bridge openings of 15 to 20 times a day, the narrowing of I-95 from a six- to eight-lane roadway to a four-lane bridge adds to the problems encountered by traffic on the approach to the Fuller Warren

Bridge. The resulting bottlenecks back up traffic for several miles on each side of St. Johns River delaying motorists for upwards of 30 to 45 minutes for each bridge opening. When the bridge fails mechanically because of the lift mechanism, any detour that is implemented winds through the downtown area. When the bridge's lift span failed in January, 1992, traffic had to be detoured for six-days and getting through Jacksonville was impossible as some motorists had to travel 60 miles to the west and utilize I-75. As a result of these delays, fuel consumption is increased and the city of Jacksonville experiences decreased air quality.

The Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] has determined that existing Bridge needs to be replaced with an eight-lane high rise fixed span structure. The replacement bridge will provide greater traffic capacity, needed safety refuge lanes, and the elimination of the frequent bridge openings and sufficiently address the safety and traffic congestion problems of the existing bridge structure.

The Fuller Warren Bridge replacement project is underway. Engineering, Final Design, and Right of Way Acquisition have already been funded. The parcels of land required have been acquired. Final design has been completed. Construction is scheduled to begin early in 1996.

However, the remaining \$185 million construction cost is unfunded. Of this \$185 million cost, about \$37 million would be non-Federal contributions provided by the State of Florida and \$148 million would be Federal highway funds, assuming an 80 percent Federal, 20 percent State split.

This past June, the Florida Department of Transportation [FDOT] developed a plan using local, State, and Federal funds to replace the Fuller Warren Bridge. The most important part of the plan is FDOT's decision to contribute \$100 million of right-of-way bond funds, which are now available for bridge construction in the State, towards the construction costs of the Fuller Warren replacement bridge. The Jacksonville Transportation Authority [JTA] has stepped up to the plate and committed \$25 million for the Fuller Warren Bridge. The final piece of the financial puzzle will come from S. 440, the National Highway System bill because it allows Florida's Transportation Department to use a sizeable portion of \$97.5 million from a transportation project that has been terminated for the Fuller Warren Bridge. On behalf of the city of Jacksonville, I thank all of you.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not mention my concerns about the provisions in this bill which repeal our Nation's speed limit. Repeal of the national speed limit law endangers the safety of all Americans. Some State officials have already indicated their intent to immediately move to repeal safety laws if the Federal programs are eliminated. In several States, speed limits automatically go above 65 mph if the national maximum speed limit is repealed. If the national speed limit is repealed and we return to pre-1974 conditions, the Federal Transportation Department estimates that we will be faced with an additional 4,750 highway deaths each year, at a cost of \$15 billion.

Who pays the price, if the speed limit is repealed? Taxpayers ultimately bear the cost for

emergency medical and police response, medical treatment, days or years of lost productivity, disability compensation for the motor vehicle crashes that will result from higher speed limits.

We know that speed is a factor in nearly one-third of all traffic fatalities and that motor vehicle crashes already cost society more than \$137 billion every year. The health care portion is approximately \$14 billion—of which Medicare and Medicaid pay \$3.7 billion or almost 30 percent.

I strongly believe that we will see a dramatic increase in highway death as a result of this bill. I hope that I will be proven wrong, but I think that the supporters of the repeal will realize their mistake and we will be back on the House floor to correct it.

Despite my concerns, I will support this conference report and ask President Clinton to sign S. 440 when it reaches his desk.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on this important measure to continue the Nation's efforts to update and expand its infrastructure of national highways.

I would like to draw the House's attention to one provision that makes changes to the inspection and maintenance requirements in title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Effective inspection and maintenance of motor vehicles is a cornerstone of this Nation's efforts to reduce air pollution. It should remain so since it happens to be one of the most cost-effective ways of reducing emissions.

Having said that, I have long had concerns about the lack of flexibility exhibited by EPA in implementing the enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance mandate. It should be remembered that the overly-prescriptive approach that EPA originally embarked upon was developed and implemented by the Bush administration. Administrator Browner has since attempted to create more flexibility for States. EPA has dropped the Bush administration's opposition to centralized inspection and maintenance programs and will approve alternative approaches. It has also indicated in recent policy statements that there will be no automatic discount for States that bring in these alternatives.

While these are the proper positions, there remains some skepticism that the rank and file at EPA have truly open minds about letting alternative programs submitted by States receive the proper amount of credit. Because of that, this bill includes legislative language which essentially writes into law the flexibility that EPA has already indicated it will give States.

This new provision includes an opportunity for States to secure interim approval of alternative programs with EPA required to grant the State the full amount of the proposed credit during the interim period. This submission must be supported by efforts in the State to implement the program including developing regulations and securing legislative authorities.

As noted, EPA must approve the full amount of the credits claimed, where the credits reflect good faith estimates. By this, we are not asking EPA to consider the State's motives but rather asking EPA to ensure that the State's estimates are based on some basic technical assessment that includes appropriate

technical and empirical data wherever possible. However, EPA should not mandate any presumptive discount and should review and consider any alternative programs on their individual merits.

With these additions, I am confident that the inspection and maintenance provisions of the Clean Air Act can provide economical emissions reductions vital to move the country toward the national goal of clean air.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the National Highway System is finally being approved. This bill will create for America in the 21st century what the interstate system has done for America in the 20th century.

As a Texan sitting on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am particularly supportive of this legislation because it recognizes the importance of Interstate 35 as a high-priority corridor. I-35 is the only interstate in our Nation that connects Canada, Mexico, and the United States. I-35 is particularly vital to my home of Dallas and the entire State of Texas because it serves as our main corridor of trade with Mexico.

With the passage of the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] in 1993, trade with Mexico is expected to double by the end of the century and quadruple between the United States and Mexico within the next 25 years. The responsibility of Congress did not end with that historic vote. Passage of the NHS is a continuation of developing an infrastructure that maximizes the benefits of this agreement.

The NHS represents some of our Nation's most heavily traveled byways, containing 40 percent of total vehicle travel and 75 percent of heavy truck travel. More importantly to anyone who travels our roads, the NHS means safety for travelers. Improvement of shoulders, controlled access, and divided lanes will help reduce accidents and fatalities.

However, while the focus of this legislation is to designate the NHS, it also has many provisions with which I do not agree. Unfortunately, this bill would repeal the Federal speed limit and allow States to have no speed limit at all if they wished. It would effectively repeal the motorcycle helmet requirement for individuals under the age of 18. I believe that these provisions seriously threaten our Nation's highway safety.

I support this bill simply because it will bring the State of Texas approximately \$455,792,000 and identifies 13,389 miles which will be the top priority miles for America as we move into the next century.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Surface Transportation Subcommittee Chairman TOM PETRI, and ranking minority member of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee NICK RAHALL, I submit the following statement for the RECORD.

Section 314 of the bill amends subsection (S) of title 23. Under this provision, it is clarified that States have the sole discretionary authority to determine whether to permit the construction and maintenance of new outdoor advertising structures within commercial and industrial segments of scenic byways. It has the further effect of modifying the standards under which section 1047 of ISTEA is implemented.

Scenic byway programs are created by States with their own unique criteria for des-

ignating scenic byways. The provision clarifies that if a State determines that a segment is inconsistent with a State's criteria for designating such roads, it may segment out those portions from the designation and may choose to erect new billboards on those segments.

The provision also clarifies that the Secretary of Transportation's authority is limited to assuring that a State has a reasonable basis for excluding a segment of an interstate or Federal-aid primary highway from scenic byways designation consistent with the State's scenic byway criteria, and that the State's action is not solely intended to evade Federal requirements regarding the prohibition of new billboards on scenic byways. Where a State exclusion is reasonable, that determination is controlling.

One of the Federal Highway Administration's very first actions after the enactment of ISTEA was to issue an advisory that construed the provisions of subsection (S) to prohibit the construction of all new billboards on any State-designated scenic byways, including commercial and industrial areas incorporated within the byway. The FHWA's preemption policy was wrong as a matter of law because it conflicted directly with the basic structure of the Highway Beautification Act that expressly preserves the authority of the States to control outdoor advertising in commercial and industrial areas adjacent to controlled highways. The policy was ill conceived as a practical matter as well. The FHWA interpretation forced the States against their will to extend scenic byways regulation to inherently nonscenic areas. It also compromised economic development along scenic byways by impairing the ability of travel and tourism businesses within those areas to advertise themselves to the users of the highway.

As the folly of this policy became clear, FHWA reversed its position and issued a segmentation policy in June 1993 that recognized State discretion to permit new billboards within the commercial and industrial segments that punctuate virtually every scenic byway. In a June 14, 1993 FHWA memorandum, it states:

Scenic byways designated before, on, or after December 18, 1991, need not be continuous. A State may wish to exclude from existing or future scenic byway designation highway sections that have no scenic value, and which have been designated solely to preserve system continuity. We do not find that section 131(S) restricts a State from taking administrative action to remove from scenic byway designation any section lacking in scenic value which was included for continuity purposes. However, the exclusion of a highway section must have a reasonable basis. The Federal interest is in preventing action designed solely to evade Federal requirements.

Unfortunately, the FHWA implemented its revised segmentation policy in a sporadic manner. As a result, there is broad confusion among the States regarding the scope of FHWA's authority in this area. The FHWA failed to issue any specific guidance to the States on how to implement segmentation in a manner that it would not be seen solely as an effort to evade the requirements of section 131(S) that prohibit billboards in truly scenic, noncommercial areas.

Accordingly, the statement of manager's language emphasizes that the conference

substitute codifies the current implementation of section 131(S) in order to specifically freeze in place a congressional finding that compliance with the methodology and procedures followed by Virginia are sufficient to establish that a State has a reasonable basis for excluding certain scenic byways segments in a manner consistent with that State's scenic byways criteria. In this regard, the Virginia Department of Transportation made its determination based on onsite inspection of individual byways and identified the existing and future commercial and industrial areas within those corridors that it determined to exclude from scenic designation.

The review of Virginia byway designation for the Lonesome Pine and Daniel Boone Heritage Trails is inserted in the RECORD as a specific example of sufficient State action necessary to show the State has a reasonable basis for excluding certain scenic byways segments in a manner consistent with that State's scenic byways criteria. The review is as follows:

REVIEW OF VIRGINIA BYWAY DESIGNATION
LONESOME PINE AND DANIEL BOONE HERITAGE TRAILS

In July 1994, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) conducted a review of the portions of the highways within the federal-aid primary system of highways, as that system existed on June 1, 1991, which comprise the Trail of the Lonesome Pine and the Daniel Boone Heritage Trail designated as Virginia Byways by the General Assembly. The review was limited to adverse impacts the byway designation had due to restricted use of property zones commercial or industrial by the local governments and unzoned commercial or unzoned industrial areas defended by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, hereinafter, commercial or industrial areas, to comply with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA).

It was determined that compliance with Section 1046(c) of the ISTEA amendments to Section 131(s) of Title 23 of the U.S.C. restricted 174 existing uses, 192 potential uses and 58 miles of commercial or industrial areas adjacent to the 247 miles of the Virginia Byways which are classified as federal-aid primary highways. The byways traverse to go through 13 cities or incorporated towns.

Subsequent to the designation of the trails as Virginia Byways, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Deputy Chief Counsel issued a legal opinion on May 13, 1993 as to the meaning of 23 U.S.C. 131(s). The legal opinion, in part, included the statement "Under ISTEA, Congress left to a State's discretion the designation of a scenic byway under the State's scenic byway program. There was no limitation as to what highways a State could designate as scenic byways. If such highways pass through commercial and industrial areas, it is up to the State to determine if the scenic values of such areas merit protection as part of a scenic byway." On June 14, 1993, the FHWA Associate Administrator for Program Development issued an informational letter to this effect as well. A copy of the legal opinion and the informational letter are attached.

From its visual inspection of the sections of the commercial and industrial areas adjacent to federal-aid primary portions of the Virginia Byways comprising the trails referenced hereinbefore, VDOT has determined that such commercial and industrial areas

do not have scenic values that merit protection as part of the Virginia Byways. Therefore, commensurate with the federal legal opinion and administration's clarification referenced hereinbefore, the General Assembly of Virginia can amend the Acts of Assembly, 1993 (H.R. 2068) to delete the Virginia Byway designation of portions of highways therein adjacent to commercial and industrial areas through enactment of a bill containing the attached language without impacting VDOT's ability to comply with ISTEA and other federal mandates a required to receive its full share of federal monies appropriated for transportation programs.

Moreover, the Virginia Byway and Trail signs are in place and can continue to be maintained if the commercial and industrial areas are excluded from the byway designation.

In contrast, the language in section 314, consistent with FHWA's current policy, does not permit categorical exclusions of commercial and industrial areas from State designated scenic byways without consideration of whether those areas are consistent or inconsistent with the State's own criteria. For example, the State of Louisiana proposed legislation to exclude commercial and industrial areas from scenic byway legislation. In a May 17, 1995, FHWA memorandum on the Louisiana legislation, FHWA stated:

The proposed language automatically excludes commercial and industrial areas from the Louisiana byways system without consideration of the intrinsic qualities contained in the Louisiana byways criteria within those areas. To exclude any commercial or industrial area from scenic byway designation it must be determined that there is an absence of these intrinsic qualities.

Section 314 of the conference report makes it clear that a State's determination to exempt specific scenic byways segments for new billboard construction is also dispositive in the implementation of any scenic byways program promulgated under section 1047 of ISTEA. In May 1995, the FHWA issued a national scenic byways program interim policy, FHWA Docket No. 95-15. Section 11 of that policy paralleled the provisions of 131(S) and prohibited new billboards on those segments of controlled highways that are State-designated scenic byways. However, section 11 further required the States to prohibit billboards on portions of the interstate and Federal-aid systems incorporated into the national scenic byways program even where those roads were not a State designated scenic byway. As such, this second provision in section 11 is completely inconsistent with section 131(S) which limits the scope of the prohibition on new billboards to State-designated scenic byways. Likewise, the provision undermines the FHWA's own segmentation policy because it eliminates a State's discretion to exclude portions of its roads from scenic byway regulations and has chilled the nomination process.

The conference report resolves these issues by making it clear that the authority of the State's discretion to exclude segments from scenic byways designation under 131(S) applies equally with respect to any action by the Secretary pursuant to section 1047. Accordingly, FHWA may not engage in rulemaking, or take any administrative action under either section 131(S) or section 1047, that has the

effect of preempting or compromising the States' discretion. As a result, the Secretary does not have the authority to compel a State to seek the prior approval of the Secretary for its actions in this regard. Rather, the Secretary's authority is limited to a determination, after the fact, of whether a State had a reasonable basis for excluding a segment of a scenic byway consistent with its scenic byways standards to determine whether the States' action was intended solely to evade Federal protection of truly scenic noncommercial areas. In the event that the Secretary makes that determination, the State has the ability to revise or withdraw its exclusion determination.

The implementation of sections 131(S) and 1047 has been greatly complicated by the FHWA's overly expansive interpretations of its own authority. Through section 314 of the conference report, the Congress has made it clear that the discretion is vested with the States alone to exempt segments of scenic byways from the billboard prohibition and to make reasonable judgments regarding the location of billboards in those areas. The FHWA should immediately make appropriate revisions to its national scenic byway program interim policy and take other steps to reaffirm the broad authority of States' discretion under sections 131(S) and 1047.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on this legislation to designate the National Highway System.

As I look back over the legislative process that brought us to finalizing this conference agreement, I can best describe it in the words of the Grateful Dead: "What a long strange trip it's been."

I say this because this body first passed NHS designation legislation last year.

We did it more than a full year before the October 1, 1995, deadline that caused the sequestration of \$5.2 billion worth of Federal highway funds to the States. Yet, at the time, the Senate refused to conference with us.

And I say this because this year, after both bodies passed NHS bills, the conference lasted approximately 8 weeks, during which time we considered a number of strange and wondrous proposals advanced by the other body.

Meanwhile, the States have now been subjected to the loss of all Federal Interstate maintenance and NHS funds for a month and a half now.

It has been a long strange trip indeed, but that trip is now coming to an end.

We bring before the House this day a conference report that at least accomplishes the fundamental purpose of this whole exercise: the designation of a new National Highway System in this country that will be the centerpiece of the post-interstate era.

In effect, the crown jewels of America's highways.

That designation, despite the misgivings many of us have over other aspects of this legislation, is of overriding concern in terms of national need and public interest, and causes this gentleman from West Virginia to urge the speedy enactment of this legislation.

It is true that I am no fan of repealing the national speed limit, that repeal is included in the conference agreement.

And it is true that I am deeply concerned, and have grave misgivings, over the potential adverse safety consequences of provisions of this legislation aimed at minimizing Federal regulation of delivery trucks, as well as hours of service waivers for a number of trucking sectors.

These items would not be in a bill that I crafted.

Yet, it is the majority will of both the House and Senate that these provisions be contained in this legislation. We fought our battles over them, and we fought them fairly under an open committee process and under an open rule of the House floor.

And so, as I have noted, many of us have misgivings over this legislation but all in all, it is a must-pass bill because without the designation of the NHS, the States will continue to be denied \$5.2 billion in Federal highway funds, and the Nation, as a whole, will suffer.

I commend this conference report to the House and urge its adoption.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the West Side of Manhattan, the local elected officials from New York City, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, the Porkbusters Coalition, and now the House and Senate, for the second time, have made it clear; they do not want the Federal Government to pay \$300 million to move a newly refurbished highway in my district so that the tenants of Donald Trump's proposed luxury high-rise Riverside South development will have an unobstructed view of the Hudson River.

As most of the Members of this body know by now I have been working for several years to kill the Trump-backed, \$300 million Miller Highway relocation project in my own congressional district. I am pleased to say that because of the language in this NHS conference report, any plans to use taxpayer funds for this ill-conceived project are now defunct. The language in this report takes away all remaining ISTEA funding for this porkbarrel boondoggle. I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their work in conference to ensure this project was not allowed to proceed. This is a victory for good government, but most of all, it is a victory for the American taxpayer who would have been asked to pay the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of clarifying a statement I made during the floor consideration of the conference report of S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995.

In my statement, I discussed that lock and dam No. 4 is a critical transportation project that requires \$4 million in funding to complete the bridge. I inadvertently referred to lock and dam No. 4 as a project in my district. Lock and dam No. 4 is located in the Fourth District of Arkansas.

The NHS bill provides the State of Arkansas with \$7 million total in additional funding from rescissions—from this fund. These funds are on top of Arkansas' regular Federal highway funding. Arkansas could use these funds to complete lock and dam No. 4.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank you for your willingness to work with Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TOWNS, and myself on the crisis surrounding the Gowanus Expressway. This

legislation will begin to address the devastating effects that this project will have on the community.

While the proposed reconstruction of the Gowanus Expressway is one of the costliest highway projects in the State's history and will profoundly shape both west Brooklyn and regional transportation for decades to come, its planning and environmental review to date have been inadequate. The bill encourages the State to take a comprehensive new look at the project. This guarantees that the total cost and benefits of both the State's plan and other proposals affecting the surrounding communities and the region as a whole will be examined.

The provisions require that the State of New York mitigate the economic and social impacts this project will have on the neighboring communities. Congress has clarified this with accompanying report language that instructs the State to minimize long-term impairment of local businesses, appoint a community engineer, and undertake traffic calming studies.

As the State moves forward with reconstruction of the Gowanus Expressway, it must hold to a minimum the harmful effects to businesses, housing, quality of life, and maintain the citizens' ability of movement with their communities. I am especially concerned that steps are taken to protect the welfare of children, the aged and others vulnerable to the effects of heavy traffic, air, and noise pollution.

While there is still much that must be done before the Gowanus Expressway rehabilitation adequately protects the community, adopting this language is the first step in insuring that this project is completed in an efficient manner, and with the safety and best interest of the surrounding community in mind.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany S. 440, the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. Certain provisions in this report are of particular importance to my constituents and to all of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Existing regulations implementing the Clean Air Act would force Pennsylvania to accept a centralized, test-only auto emissions inspection and maintenance program in order to be deemed in compliance with that act. The test-only program would require citizens to bounce back and forth between test centers and auto repair garages and would leave auto technicians guessing about whether their work was successful in addressing their customer's problems. The citizens of Pennsylvania voiced their extreme dissatisfaction with such a program when it was proposed by our previous Governor, and the State legislature repealed the statute which provided for that program.

Provisions in this conference report eliminate the arbitrary automatic 50 percent penalty in emissions reductions credit that the regulations would impose on States that preferred a decentralized approach. While I was not a Member of Congress when the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments were enacted, I do not believe that Congress intended to require the one-size-fits-all program that these regulations force on the States. The elimination of this penalty would restore to the States the flexibility that Congress intended that they have in creating programs that will make the most

sense in their States. Additionally, under the provisions, States like Pennsylvania whose legislature has not yet passed enabling legislation will have 120 days to do so, as well as, to propose accompanying regulations. The Congress is aware of the burden imposed upon Pennsylvania by this timetable since it coincides with the time in which the Pennsylvania legislature must also develop a budget that must be enacted by June 30. The parties to the agreement are aware of Pennsylvania's concerns with the small window and intend to work with them. We also hope that EPA will be flexible in working with Pennsylvania as it develops its plan.

Pennsylvania's current Governor, Tom Ridge, has proposed a decentralized test-and-repair program that he believes can meet the goals of the Clean Air Act without visiting undue hardship and inconvenience on the motorists and auto repair businesses of Pennsylvania. The inspection and maintenance provisions in this conference report would allow Pennsylvania to complete the design and implementation of a program on this decentralized basis and would allow that program to be judged on its actual performance over an 18-month period, rather than by an arbitrary rule.

I believe that reducing ozone pollution and improving the quality of the air that we breathe is of great importance to my constituents and to the rest of the citizens of Pennsylvania. I also believe that the States know what will best work to achieve the goal and should have the latitude to design programs that make sense for their citizens. I believe that these provisions give that needed latitude to Pennsylvania and to other States that are currently wrestling with this problem, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and specifically the provision within this legislation addressing the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] implementation of the enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance program [I&M] under sections 182, 184, and 187 of the Clean Air Act.

The 1990 Clean Air Act amendments required certain ozone and carbon monoxide nonattainment areas—as well as certain areas within ozone transport regions—to adopt enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance programs. The act was intended to afford States maximum flexibility in designing their I&M programs. However, in several hearings conducted by the Commerce Committee's Oversight Subcommittee it has become apparent that EPA has taken the enhanced I&M program and attempted to force States into a one-size-fits-all approach. That approach, a centralized or test-only program that favors testing with IM240 equipment, has been resisted, and in some cases rejected, by States and by our constituents as too costly and too inconvenient. In addition, many States and outside experts question whether EPA's centralized approach is indeed more effective than a decentralized approach.

The amendments to the Clean Air Act contained in this bill are designed to require EPA to allow for more flexibility in the implementation of the enhanced I&M program. First, the provision prevents EPA from automatically assuming that decentralized or test-and-repair programs are approximately 50 percent less

effective than centralized or test-only programs. Second, it would allow States an 18-month period in which States could configure their own I&M program, experimenting with various network and equipment types. Because it will be difficult to determine a priori exact emissions reductions achieved by such a program, requirements that States propose credits in good faith should be construed loosely. EPA would then be required to base emission reduction credits on the actual data from the I&M program, rather than basing credits on assumptions within a computer model. In developing this credit, the burden should be upon EPA to demonstrate that provisional credits proposed by the States are inappropriate. EPA is then required to adjust credits as appropriate as demonstrated by the program data, which could include actual emission tests results, remote sensing, or other relevant data.

The message of this legislation to EPA regarding the enhanced inspection and maintenance program is clear. Congress is not happy with the present course EPA has taken. This legislation should be viewed as a response to EPA's statements that it will continue to discount decentralized or test-and-repair I&M programs up to 50 percent based on model assumptions. Such statements run counter to the statutory language and intent of this provision which are to allow States, such as Virginia, an opportunity to demonstrate to EPA what credits for decentralized programs should be from actual program data.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. With its passage begins the resolution of years of questionable implementation of the inspection and maintenance [I&M] program by EPA, required by sections 182, 184, and 187 of the Clean Air Act. The controversy began with the finalization of the 1992 rule. Within that rule was an assumption that decentralized or test-and-repair I&M programs were approximately 50 percent less effective than centralized or test-only programs. In addition, the final rule removed a provision within the proposed rule which would have given States a 2-year period to demonstrate the effectiveness of enhanced decentralized programs. Three years later, EPA has yet to convince States that such a discount is appropriate, and the I&M issue is as yet unresolved. This legislation begins to resolve this dispute by restoring a demonstration period in which States will be permitted to demonstrate appropriate credits.

Earlier this year, the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, which I chair, held two hearings on the inspection and maintenance issue. Those hearings called into question the basis for the so called 50-percent discount. At the time of the hearing, EPA stated that it relied on 15 years of vehicle audit and tampering data to justify this discount. However, evidence produced by the California I/M Review Committee and Dr. Doug Lawson of Desert Research Institute called into question whether this data supported the discount.

At the hearing, and in follow-up questions, however, EPA stated that the basis for the discount was not audit and tampering data, but from two indepth studies conducted in California. These indepth studies of California's de-

centralized program indicated that reductions were 20 percent for hydrocarbons [HC], 15 percent for carbon monoxide [CO], and 7 percent for nitrogen oxides [Nox], about half what they were expected to be, according to EPA—hence the 50-percent discount. But EPA estimates credits for a decentralized program are appropriate 6.5-percent reductions in HC, 12.6 for CO, and 1.5 percent for Nox, much less than the reductions found in California.

Outside studies of "real world" data also called into question EPA's system of credits. Two engineering professors from the University of Minnesota found that a centralized I&M program recently adopted in the Minneapolis/St. Paul region was achieving only a 1-percent reduction in CO. EPA had originally predicted the program would reduce CO emissions by 30 percent. They later revised that estimate to 9-percent reductions. If centralized testing is so effective, why would the centralized program be expected to achieve only a 9-percent reduction in CO, when decentralized programs in general are predicted to achieve a 12.6 percent reduction in CO. Finally, "real world" evidence taken from hundreds of thousands of remote sensing readings further indicate that whether a program is centralized or decentralized was relatively unimportant to the effectiveness of the program.

The provision in this bill therefore, asks EPA to go back to the drawing board. By restoring flexibility to the States, it is hoped that States will experiment with various I&M configurations, such as remote sensing. EPA should use data from State programs to measure the performance of centralized verses decentralized programs, and both types should be examined relative to the performance standard. In particular, I am hopeful that States and EPA will use this opportunity to refocus I&M on that small minority of vehicles that cause most of the pollution. Data indicates that as few as 10 percent of the vehicles cause over 50 percent of the pollution. Therefore, techniques that screen out gross polluters such as remote sensing, should be seriously considered.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 440.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123), making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing the following projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995:

(1) All projects and activities necessary to provide for the expenses of Medicare contractors under title XVIII of the Social Security Act under the account heading "Program management" under the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) All projects and activities funded under the account heading "Limitation on administrative expenses" under the Social Security Administration.

(3) All projects and activities necessary to process and provide for veterans compensation, pension payments, dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) payments, and to provide for veterans medical care under the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act which included funding for fiscal year 1996 for the projects and activities listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 1995, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1995, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the average of the rates permitted by the action of the House or the Senate under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act which included funding for fiscal year 1996 for the projects and activities listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of October 1, 1995, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. No appropriations or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 104. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995

and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) September 30, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 106. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 105(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 109. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that all military paychecks go out on time on December 1, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, by adding the following new paragraph.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; I do not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, 30,000 young veterans did not get their GI bill checks this week to go to college. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the

purpose stated by the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield at this time.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. OBEY. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would at least let me explain what it is I am doing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First, the gentleman will state his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include language which would insert in this bill, in its proper place, the agreement on an entire CR that was offered to the Republican leadership of the Congress last night by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana reserve the right to object?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman objects.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, to permit all research projects and activities at the National Cancer Institute to continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, allowing all nursing homes safety and standards enforcement activities to continue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will describe shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to assure that America's great national parks remain open, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, by adding the following new paragraph: All activities necessary to operate the national parks and monuments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain my objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, allowing for the Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf to be funded so that they might not have to close in 10 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House to make a statement when we are making a unanimous-consent request? Is it regular order of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When regular order is demanded, the Chair will ask whether or not the gentleman objects or yields for that purpose.

Mr. DELAY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Am I allowed to ask for regular order on unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman is allowed to ask for regular order when there is a reservation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is a Member allowed to complete his or her unanimous-consent request before being cutoff by any other Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is up to the gentleman making the motion to suspend the rules as to whether or not he yields for that request.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in the process of asking the unanimous-consent request, is it proper that a Member is cutoff before finishing the sentence, which is part of the unanimous consent request? When one is not making any editorial comment about the request, one is simply making the request, is it within the House rules to cut off Members from making that request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is Mr. LIVINGSTON's motion, and it is his prerogative to yield or not yield. He has permitted all of these unanimous-consent requests to be stated and has then

objected by refusing to yield. The gentleman is perfectly within his right.

Mr. EDWARDS. So they can be objected to before we finish asking the unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not have to yield at all.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one last unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, after line 19, that the resolution may be amended to allow the continuation of all projects and activities of the FBI and the Border Patrol and unemployment compensation benefits activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House this further continuing House Joint Resolution 123 that would provide spending authority for three important functions of our Government, while action on appropriations is proceeding.

I think that it is significant, as I am sure the gentlemen who authored the alternative motions might agree, that most of the Government has been shut down since last Tuesday; however, we are seeing significant progress. The military construction bill has been signed into law by the President. The Agriculture bill has been signed into law by the President. The Energy and water bill has been signed into law by the President. The Transportation appropriations bill has been signed into law by the President.

Today we have the agreement from the administration to sign the legislative branch appropriations bill and the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill.

Likewise, the House and the Senate have now sent the National Security bill down to the President for his signature or his veto, whichever comes first.

It is my great hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will sign that Defense bill, because I understand that the President has already indicated his intention to deploy as many as 25,000 troops to Bosnia.

This House went on record just yesterday saying that it has not been inclined to support that effort, yet the President says he is not only going to send those troops to Bosnia; he says that he thinks that the Congress has appropriated too much for the Defense Department.

Now, which is it, Mr. Speaker? Does the President intend to send troops to Bosnia, and if so, how does he intend to pay for them? If he does not intend to send the troops to Bosnia, how does he intend to pay for the Defense budget? And is he truly concerned about how the troops get paid?

One of the issues that has been raised by one of the gentlemen who stood up at the well here a few minutes ago was his concern that the troops be paid. This Congress in both the House and the Senate has completed the National Security appropriations bill. Under that bill, all of our troops will be paid.

Now, if the President is concerned about the welfare of the troops that he intends to be deployed into harm's way in Bosnia, he will sign that bill. He will sign that bill and our troops will be paid. As soon as he signs that bill, it will become law. However, if he vetoes that bill, he will be saying that not only does he intend to send troops to Bosnia to put them in harm's way, but he does not intend to pay them while they are there. Now, that is absolutely ludicrous.

So I appreciate one of the gentlemen who stood up and said that he was concerned about the welfare of the troops, but I would urge him not to waste time with motions here on the floor and go to the President of the United States and say, Mr. President, you should sign that bill, sign that national defense bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know how hard and how difficult this process has been in the last couple of weeks, but we also know how and why this has occurred. We also know that many activities of government can continue to operate under a determination that they are essential to maintaining the public health and safety, even though there is no funding authority for those activities which have not yet passed into law at this time.

This continuing resolution would remove the uncertainty of certain continued operations for several critical Government functions, and I might add, this is the first shot. This is the first rifle shot. If, in fact, the Congress

and the President of the United States cannot reach an agreement in the days ahead, there will be others, there will be other attempts to address specific functions, many of which may have been approached or suggested by the gentlemen that preceded me with those motions.

Upon the enactment of this continuing resolution, however, these activities which I will describe shortly will be removed from any involvement in the ongoing budget situation. These activities will be able to maintain smooth, effective operations, and the people working on them will be able to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution provides funding rates at the average levels of the House and Senate fiscal year 1996 regular bills until the end of the fiscal year or until the regular bill is signed into law, whichever is first, for the following items.

Let me say, the last CR that will be sent down to the President—in fact, the last two CR's that have been sent down to the President—called for a level at the lower of the House or Senate 1995 levels. This continuing resolution calls for the average of the House and Senate or the House and last year. So this is less restrictive than the continuing resolutions have been for these specific functions of Government.

First, all expenses of Medicare contractors to determine claims and to pay individuals and hospitals; second, all administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration to pay benefits and to process claims; third, all expenses to provide for veterans' compensation, pensions and medical care, including paying benefits and processing claims.

Mr. Speaker, several of these activities, the Social Security Administration and Medicare, are directly linked to trust fund activities for which the funding has already been collected, and the authority to administer these activities needs to be granted and to not involve appropriations from the general fund.

The other one, the veterans' compensation and pensions section, is an appropriated entitlement and, as such, these benefits are required by law.

These are all extremely important functions, as are some of the functions that have been detailed by the gentlemen that preceded me in their motions. These are very, very important, and they need to continue, even though we have currently found ourselves at a budget impasse.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the budget impasse can be over today. The President could sign on to a 7-year balanced budget agreement whereby the scoring of the numbers would be performed by the Congressional Budget Office. He could sign on to that today and this impasse would be over.

He has even said that he was for a 5-year balanced budget, a 10-year balanced budget, a 9-year balanced budget, a 7-year balanced budget, an 8-year balanced budget; but of course he also said that he was not for a balanced budget at all. In fact, his most detailed presentation of a balanced budget, notwithstanding the incredibly high levy of taxes that he imposed on the American people 2 years ago, the most important detailed budget that he has provided to the people of America was last February when he gave us a budget that called for \$200 billion in deficits, this year, next year, the year after that, the year after that and as far as the eye can see.

□ 1345

The President, of course, we know, has been on all sides of this issue.

We call on him to say, OK, focus your attention, Mr. President, on a balanced budget, within 7 years, gives you plenty of time.

Let us work together toward a balanced budget, within 7 years, let us agree on it today, and the rest of this budget impasse will be totally and absolutely irrelevant and unnecessary, because we can fund all of the functions of government, not just the emergency functions, not just the most essential, not just the most important, we can fund all of Government on a glide path toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are here with this rifle shot on these very important issues because we are not so sure that is going to happen. We think the President just may not meet us halfway and may not see the opportunity to agree on a 7-year balanced budget. I cannot explain why not, because if it does not happen, we want these three functions of government funded.

When these other gentlemen stand up and talk about these other functions of government, we want them funded, too. We would like to get the whole Government funded, and the President has it within his hands and his opportunity to make sure that that happens. But if it does not happen, we will approach, we will consider each one of the other issues that were raised a little while ago.

But right now we want to handle these three issues. We want to make sure that these go into law and that the people who need the Medicare contractors to determine claims and pay individuals and hospitals, the administration expenses of the Social Security Administration to pay benefits and process claims, and the people that need veterans' compensation benefits and medical care, including benefits and processing of claims, the people that need those will get attended to without regard to this budget impasse.

I think that this is a good start toward resolving a temporary crisis in certain key areas of government. Let

us pass this continuing resolution and go on to other things.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution points up the politics of what we are doing. This resolution points up that we are playing a political game and 800,000 people are not working because of that game.

Hopefully we will pass 2 bills that will put 200,000 of them back and send it down to the White House. We have been hearing on this floor that the only reason that a resolution should be passed and signed by the President is to make sure that we have a balanced budget. That is the critical issue, that is the critical issue of the day.

Guess what? This resolution is a clean resolution. Very easy to do. We ought to do it for all of Government.

The chairman says he wants to see Government, the whole Government, funded. That is what the chairman just said. I quoted it and wrote it down. I am glad to hear that and I think he does.

If you read these pages, there is not one word in here about a balanced budget. Why? Because this is not the bill on which we will establish the balanced budget, any more than a continuing appropriation for the entire Government will be. That will be on the reconciliation bill.

And guess what? That bill was pulled today. That bill was taken off the calendar today. It was supposed to be considered. That is the bill that establishes.

Not only that, we hear on the CR that we will go to December 3. But, guess what? For these objectives, which I will support and are very important for our veterans, those receiving Medicare and Social Security, they, my friends, will go to the end of the year. Is that not a nice political decision?

But very frankly private contractors who are working for Government and whose employees are out in the street are not going to get paid next week, or maybe the week thereafter.

Guess what? This goes to the end of the year. We are not arguing about any date. And guess what even further, folks? We are talking about funding levels, the lower of this, the lower of that and that is why we cannot send a CR down that the President will sign? Average of the two.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, the American public knows we are playing games and they are blaming all of us.

If we pass this continuing resolution and said do all of Government under

these terms, I guarantee you the President would sign this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution. It protects the veterans' compensation and pension recipients so they will receive their checks on time, and that is 3 million veterans and survivors who have earned these checks. I wish this resolution would have included educational benefits for young veterans going to college.

Mr. Speaker, 30,000 veterans did not get their checks this last week. Thirty thousand will not get their checks next week.

I did not get the chance to even explain my unanimous-consent request; it was to protect these educational benefits so that 350,000 veterans can get their benefits for the rest of the year. They are not going to be able to stay in school, Mr. Speaker, if we do not provide funds so the VA can pay these benefits.

If there is another continuing appropriation, which I heard the chairman say may occur, I hope the GI bill checks will be included.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have included insurance payments to survivors whose loved ones died. Three thousand five hundred of these checks were supposed to go to survivors of persons who had veterans' life insurance last week. Some of them gave a lot of their life to the service, and their survivors cannot get these benefits because the VA appropriation bill has not been signed. I hope that the next continuing appropriations will include these items.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, 11 words, 5 seconds. Eleven words, 5 seconds. Today with 11 words and 5 seconds this House could have sent a message to every military man and woman serving his or her country, whether they are in the United States or in the cold land of Korea that you will get your paycheck on December 1—five seconds it would have taken.

The words I was not allowed to say were simply to add with unanimous consent, that I had hoped would happen, all Department of Defense activities directly related to providing military pay.

That would have taken care of our military families on their December 1 paycheck.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said,

quote, we should not waste time on this unanimous-consent request today on the floor of the House.

I would suggest that 5 seconds is not too much to ask to send a clear message to our military families that they are going to get their paychecks on time on December 1.

The gentleman can make a point and point the finger at the President, that he should sign the appropriations bill. That is his right. I think the President should sign the bill.

But there are some important issues there. The B-2 bomber, the antiballistic missile defense system, issues that Republicans in this House fought over that the President has the right to consider.

All I am pleading with to the gentleman is that let us take 5 seconds today, let us not fingerpoint. I can point my finger at the Republicans, you can point your finger at the President. But I am not interested in pointing fingers. I am interested in paying the military families of this country on time on December 1.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to yield to me for one comment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, I did not say that we did not have time. I just objected to the gentleman's motion because it was extraneous for the purpose for which we are here today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the chairman very much.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said that 11 words could solve this problem and he and I both share the same goal. We want these people in uniform, their families, and the civilians that work for the Department of Defense as well as the other departments to get their paycheck, because a lot of them are not going to be able to make their mortgage payments and their car payments and their insurance payments and their credit card payments and their grocery bills. It is not fair that these innocent people are caught up in this. But I want to say in all sincerity to my distinguished friend who just spoke, there are two words that can solve this problem, and solve it today, and those two words are William Clinton. Sign that bill that provides the appropriations for the Department of Defense, that was passed by this House in a strong bipartisan vote, that was passed by the Senate in a strong bipartisan vote. President Clinton ought to sign this bill.

Here is something that maybe his advisers have not told him. That nearly

half of the money in the Defense appropriations bill that he wants to veto, nearly half of that money goes for salaries and housing allowances and medical care, quality of life issues for the people that serve in the military and who work as civilians for the Department of Defense. It is not all big procurement and big spending on industry. It is for the people that are ready to risk their lives to protect freedom and to protect this Nation.

If there are things in the bill that the President does not like, listen to this closely, very closely. If the President thinks we funded items in this appropriations bill that he does not like, he can send us a rescission bill, or he can send us a reprogramming. He has plenty of room to work with the Congress, and we have tried to work with him in a bipartisan fashion on national defense.

There is nothing in this argument about Medicare or Medicaid, tax increases or tax reductions, balanced budgets or anything else other than providing for the national defense and the quality of life for those who serve in our military.

What are some of the things that the President did not ask for and he is unhappy because we included them, anyway? We gave him \$647 million to pay for the contingency in Iraq that he decided to send American troops to. We provided the money to pay for that. What is wrong with that? That is up front, that is pay-as-you-go.

Barracks repair. We provided money to repair barracks that are in tragic condition. He did not ask for it. We provided it, anyway.

Training shortfalls because of other contingencies that the President spent money on around the world. We provided the money to replace that.

Breast cancer research, we added that. He did not ask for it. But if he does not like any of these, he can send us a rescission bill.

So two words, William Clinton, will solve this problem with everything relating to the national Defense Establishment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

The fact is we have still not heard from that side of the aisle one reason why you could not have included these other items including military pay. The fact is you are insisting that in order for the military to be guaranteed they are going to be getting their pay that he ought to sign a bill which makes him spend \$7 billion more than he wanted to, which makes him buy 40 B-2s rather than the 20 the Pentagon wanted, and you are holding him hostage for that. That is nonsense.

□ 1400

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this continuing resolution. It is critical for our Nation's veterans.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care and I are vitally interested in their welfare.

The 2.2 million veterans receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities will know their checks will arrive on time when we do this today. The 308,000 widows, children, and other survivors of veterans who have died of service-connected disabilities will receive their checks on time this December when we pass this continuing resolution. The 450,000 veterans who served during wartime receiving pensions will get their checks on time when we pass this resolution. It is very, very important.

It also provides that needed medical care and services will be available to our veterans and our veterans' hospitals.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the distinguished gentleman, I wish the GI bill had been included in this. I hope that can be taken care of quickly. Because that is not in here does not mean we should not go ahead and take care of these veterans.

One of the very sad chapters in this whole dispute over veterans has been the politicizing of the VA, Veterans' Administration, by the Secretary, I believe, in scaring veterans, in causing them to believe they are not going to get those checks.

There is a legal dispute as to whether or not the President could have done it. Let us make certain, let us reassure our veterans today this Congress cares about them and that we are going to ensure that they are protected.

Our veterans have already sacrificed. We need not ask them to sacrifice again. The President could have solved this easily with the stroke of his pen, I think, a very clean CR with only the commitment to the 7-year balanced budget with real numbers.

This is not a silly spat as some have suggested. This is a serious debate over serious issues confronting our country.

But let us not let those most vulnerable suffer the pain. Let us mitigate it where we can. We will do that by the passage of this CR today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds.

If you want to guarantee that pay, accept the 11 words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. That is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking Democrat on the State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the two recently passed continuing resolutions. I oppose them for fundamentally the same reason that the President is forced to be in opposition.

It is really very simple. They are not clean. Tacked on to them are requirements to negotiate upon terms that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is proposing: a 7-year balanced budget period, along with offensive economic assumptions.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that is offensive to the President, the reason that that is offensive, is because it requires cutting too deeply programs that are particularly important to the President, like cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and veterans.

With regard to the limited continuing resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, several minutes ago the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations moved a unanimous consent request that: All projects and activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Border Patrol be included. Mr. Speaker, that unanimous consent request was not accepted.

Although law enforcement agencies have been granted a general exemption from the governmentwide furlough, there are a significant number of FBI and DEA agents who are not working. According to the Department of Justice, approximately 25 percent of the FBI and the DEA personnel have been furloughed. This equates to approximately 25,000 people, Mr. Speaker, who are not currently functioning in our front-line law enforcement agencies.

The granting of this request would have enabled these people to return to work and thereby ensure that 100 percent of our law enforcement personnel would be on this job at this time.

While I am not aware, as I have indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, the law enforcement officials on the front line are not at work, we need a team out there, and it is too bad that the continuing resolution could not have included these critical functions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Just a few minutes ago I attempted under a unanimous consent to offer a unanimous-consent amendment that would have, within this bill, opened America's national parks. Now, I did not do that to embarrass anybody. I did not do that to embarrass our colleagues and friends on the Republican side. I did it to open America's national parks.

Today there are hundreds of thousands of citizens on vacation. They wanted to go into one of our national parks facilities. On an average day in

the United States, 726,000 Americans are visiting a national park facility. Those facilities are closed. If my simple unanimous-consent request had been honored, those facilities could be opened very soon.

Some people have said to me, "Well, PAT, you are from Montana. It's snowing out there. Your parks, like Yellowstone and Glacier are closed in the winter." No, they are not. They are winter wonderlands. Yellowstone is open. Many hundreds of thousands of people go to see Yellowstone in the winter. Large parts of Glacier are open.

But there is another point along with the tourists, and that is our national parks are in trouble, and the people that take care of them have been ruled to not be all that essential in the work force. For example, we just, the Federal Government, has just brought wolves into Yellowstone National Park. Those wolves are to be collared and monitored. That is not happening.

As Americans know, there is mineral development going on right on the perimeter of Yellowstone National Park. The National Park Service is working daily to try to protect the park. That is not happening now. These parks are threatened. They could have been included, the opening of them, in this resolution.

Again, I want to assure my colleagues I did not do it to embarrass anybody. I did it to get the national parks open, and I am sorry my Republican colleagues prevented me from opening the national parks.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. If the gentleman would remain at the podium, I would like to pose a question to him. The gentleman is aware that the Interior appropriations bill has been on the floor twice. May I inquire how the gentleman voted on the motion to recommit on both of those?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will yield, because I voted not to move the Interior bill through, I offered my unanimous-consent request today, and the gentleman objected to it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman has voted not to open the parks twice before today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And you objected to my unanimous-consent request to do it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, under this bill, veterans' checks, Social Security checks, Medicare checks will go out. That is fine.

But the important thing is this bill illustrates the game that is being played on the American public.

Because you see, this bill is what is called a clean continuing resolution. It has no conditions. It has no time limits. There is nothing but the ability to continue running these essential pro-

grams, and there is a reason for that, because they know that the outcry over these programs would be so great if those checks did not arrive that it would overwhelm them.

So, meanwhile, folks at NIH, National Institutes of Health, who are doing cancer research are not at work. Folks at NASA are not at work. The national parks are closed. The District of Columbia government is closed. The GI bill checks are not arriving, and FBI agents are not working. That is not fair. That is not right. And that is not necessary.

We should have a clean continuing resolution. The Republicans should stop playing this game, this silly charade. We can have a clean CR and put the entire Government back to work.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the chairman of the committee to answer a question? Would the chairman of the committee, in a spirit of bipartisanship, join with me in a unanimous consent request that as of Monday morning we open up and continue the research at the National Cancer Institutes to look for cures for cancer and for AIDS? Will the gentleman agree to that unanimous-consent in this bill?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman will not agree to the unanimous-consent at this time. However, he may at some time in the future.

Mr. DURBIN. I hope it is soon. Think about that, ladies and gentlemen.

Can we possibly be debating whether researchers at the National Cancer Institute should be on the job Monday? You know, we can count the phone calls when people call and say they are upset because they did not get their Social Security checks, they did not get their veterans' checks. It is that kind of political pressure which has resulted in this very measure that we are considering.

How can we measure the loss to this Nation if the research, the medical research which we count on to find cures for diseases to alleviate the death and suffering in America is not taking place? That is what is at stake in this debate. That is why it goes far beyond whether the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] gets an appropriate seat on Air Force One, whether or not the President has his exact language.

What we have at stake here are 700,000 Federal employees sitting home without pay while Members of Congress still receive their paychecks. That is an outrage.

What we need to hear are the voices of the American people who are sick and tired of this political charade. To

think that we would even debate whether or not the researchers will come to work on Monday to proceed at the National Cancer Institute to look for cures for cancer, that is shameful.

I sincerely hope both political parties take a look in a mirror or at the image we are projecting to the United States. The political pettiness behind this debate has reached Olympic standards.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], a member of the committee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I know the gentleman is aware that the Labor-Health and Human Services bill, in which cancer research is funded, has been stifled in the Senate by the preceding speaker's party member over in the Senate. It is being filibustered by the Democrat Party in the Senate. That is why the research bill has not gone through the House.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I am for a balanced budget by the year 2002.

But let me bring it back to something that people are concerned about around the country, and that is the pay issue. I want to read a letter that I received from Speaker GINGRICH. I want to read it slowly and also from Majority Leader BOB DOLE.

He said: "Dear Frank," and my name is FRANK.

We will be sending soon to President Clinton a bill to continue funding for the federal government through December 1, 1995. Besides providing for government services, this bill also funds federal workers' salaries.

If the President decides to veto this vital legislation to keep government operating, the possibility exists that some federal works may be furloughed. In the event that this takes place, it is our commitment that federal employees will not be punished as a direct result of the President's decision to veto funding for their salaries. Should this happen, we are committed to restoring any lost wages in a subsequent funding bill.

Again, we want to reassure you that if the President vetoes the continuing resolution and requires federal workers to be furloughed, we are committed to restoring any lost wages retroactively.

I want to say this: A promise made is a promise kept. There has been a promise made. There has been a commitment made. And we are obligated to keep it. I expect it to be kept.

I believe it will be kept because it must be kept.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. What you have just read is a letter from Speaker GINGRICH saying that every one of these employees, including all the ones that Mem-

bers on your side of the aisle have said probably were really nonessential truly anyway, you are going to pay every one of them every penny they would have earned had they been on the job. And so my only question to you is: If you are going to pay them anyway, the American taxpayer has to foot the bill, why will you not let them work?

Mr. WOLF. They should be back, and I will tell the gentleman, the administration's definition of essential and nonessential really does not make any sense.

Mr. DOGGETT. That begs the question. You are paying these people not to work when they ought to be working.

□ 1415

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute and five seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, while you all were debating here all through this day, I was at my home taking care of my wife, but I was kind of following everything going on here. I heard some Members get in this well talk about compromise and say we need to work toward a compromise. I remember the gentleman from Indiana saying that.

But during one of the votes that we had here, CNN put on a little transposition of a press conference this morning that the leader from the Senate, from Kansas, and the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, had this morning. And what did NEWT GINGRICH say about it, about the CR that we should be passing instead of this little one? No compromise. No compromise. No compromise. Those are his words, his language. That is just what he said. Senator DOLE differed a little bit. He said, "You are not speaking for me."

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that I know that why we are here today was a deliberative act on the Speaker's part to show down the government in order to try to get his budget through.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been a week. I appreciate the fact that the Speaker has committed to pay everyone who is not working, but are we committed to pay \$1 billion for no work performance? The most commonsense thing to do is to include everyone in this bill we are passing now. Put them back to work, because they are getting paid anyway. Then take the lowest of the House or the Senate or the President's budget. That is the most commonsense thing to do. We ought to start acting with commonsense.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois indicated that we

should fund cancer research. I think the record should really show he voted against the CR and his President vetoed the CR that would have allowed cancer drugs for real cancer patients that are not now paid for by Medicare. It would have been breast tumors and it would have been prostate cancer. So everyone needs to understand his statements with cancer research were done for political reasons. He voted against drugs to help real research patients.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, what Speaker GINGRICH said this morning on CNN, and I watched it very carefully, he said everything was on the table except one thing, and that was that we have to have a balanced budget in 7 years scored by CBO. That is it. He did not say there was no compromise.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, not only are Government workers affected, so are those in private industry. Last night I learned that nationwide inspectors of the Department of Defense had been pulled from various projects. That happens to include the C-17. Twenty-two world records are held by that Globemaster cargo plane.

Now, what this means is a setback in defense production. There is no question, if the President does not sign a commonsense resolution, 7 years to balance the budget and to use CBO, he will not only be putting out of work Government workers, who will be paid, he will be putting out of work union and nonunion workers who will not be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the President wake up and start thinking about the implications of his lack to come to the table and deal with this issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposition is what I would call the I-can't-take-the-heat amendment. What has happened, and I have turned this chart on its side so that people can see it from a little different perspective, what has happened is that so far four appropriation bills have been passed by the Congress. The White House has asked that the Congress send the additional two which are ready to be sent up to the White House up to the White House so they can sign them.

That will still leave over 80 percent of the Government unfunded on the appropriations side, not because the President did not sign any bills, but because the Congress has not sent them to him yet. I do not know how the

President can be expected to sign bills that have not gotten to him yet.

Then, because of this huge performance gap in this Congress, what the Speaker and his allies are doing is saying: OK, Mr. President, because we have not done our work, we are going to see to it that these hundreds of thousands of Federal workers do not report to their jobs until you agree to blackmail, and until you agree to take our negotiating position on another piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Members on the Republican side of the aisle are feeling the heat, and so what they have done is produce what I consider to be essentially a political document. They say: Well, Social Security is a hot button, so, all right, we will let Social Security go. VA is a hot button, so we are going to let VA go. Medicare is a hot button, so we are going to let some of the activities in Medicare go.

That is, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], has said, a good political decision. But the right substantive position is to let all of those programs go, and let the entire Government function while we work out our differences on the other piece of legislation which is not even supposed to be involved in this fight.

Now, last night the President's representatives made a reasonable offer to the Senate, and Mr. GINGRICH turned it down. Now Mr. GINGRICH and his allies are saying it is not negotiable; we must have a 7-year balanced budget, on CBO guidelines.

The President is simply saying: I would like to see a balanced budget. But if you fellows are going to insist on whacking Medicare, and if you are going to insist on whacking Medicaid, if you are going to insist on smashing opportunity for kids who are trying to go to college, and if you are going to insist on a huge tax cut, than you cannot responsibly get there in 7 years, and so we may have to talk about a different timeline.

Because of that rational difference, you are saying we are going to hold up the entire Federal Government. I think this performance has been absolutely, incredibly, incredibly disgraceful.

I would simply like to say this: When the American people voted to put you folks in charge in November, I think what they thought they were doing is that they were going to force both parties to work together. I think they thought they would end gridlock by putting both parties in charge of opposite branches of Government so that we had to work together.

Instead, what we are getting is a very different record. I will repeat what I said on the floor last week: When I chaired this committee last year, all 13 of these appropriation bills were passed on time, they were signed by the President, there was no need for a continuing resolution, not a single Government worker was held out of work.

Do you know why? Because I had a Speaker who allowed me to cross the aisle and talk to the ranking Republican and say "Let's work this out on a bipartisan basis." That is exactly what we did, and because we had a bipartisan, functioning House, we were able to get that done.

The reason that has not happened this year and we have this performance gap is that we have a different kind of Speaker. We are not going to have a different Speaker, but we had better get a different attitude out of him if this country is going to survive this petty food fight which he has started and insisted on keeping going.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed an interesting spectacle today. It was our original intention to ensure that veterans, Social Security recipients and Medicare contractors get some relief in this bill.

Now we find that the same people who opposed the Defense bill all year want to pay defense salaries. We find the same people who voted twice against the Interior bill want to open the national parks. Now we find that the same people whose political party has filibustered the Labor-Health and Human Services bill in the Senate now want to pay for cancer research, even though they know full well that bill contains that cancer research.

I have a modest proposal here. There is no argument on the worthiness of these three items. Let us pass this bill, get these three items fully funded, and worry about the rest. If you vote against this bill, you are against putting all of these good people to work on these worthy programs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuing resolution before us this evening. I am deeply gratified that the majority leadership and the President were finally able to reach a mutually acceptable agreement and reopen the doors of Government. By returning Federal workers to their jobs, both sides have demonstrated their determination to put the good of the American people above both minor political and major philosophical differences. I applaud the work of the leadership, but now, we must roll up our sleeves and get down to work closing the gap between the priorities of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. And priorities is what this entire debate has been about. We on the Democratic side of the aisle have said many times that we are in favor of a balanced budget and I personally have voted for one. However, along with this desire for a zero deficit, I also have a fundamental set of beliefs and principles which I can not abandon. Throughout, it has been above all else, for me, a question of getting the fairest budget possible for the working men and women of this country. It is imperative that we pass a plan that is both fiscally responsible and socially accountable. It must address the needs of those very families and individuals who voted for each and every Member of this House of Representatives. The

immediate crisis has passed, but we can not rest for there is yet a long road to travel before our work is done and the President has signed all 13 appropriations bills. Only after that is done and the motor of the Federal Government returned to full throttle, should we contemplate resting. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make our Federal Government more effective and efficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 123.

The question was taken.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, now voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 818]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Chapman	Ensign
Ackerman	Chenoweth	Eshoo
Allard	Christensen	Evans
Andrews	Chrysler	Everett
Archer	Clay	Ewing
Armey	Clayton	Farr
Bachus	Clement	Fattah
Baesler	Clinger	Fawell
Baker (CA)	Clyburn	Fazio
Baldacci	Coble	Fields (TX)
Ballenger	Coburn	Flner
Barcia	Coleman	Flake
Barr	Collins (GA)	Flanagan
Barrett (NE)	Collins (IL)	Foglietta
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Foley
Bartlett	Combest	Forbes
Barton	Condit	Ford
Bass	Conyers	Fowler
Bateman	Cooley	Fox
Becerra	Costello	Frank (MA)
Bellenson	Cox	Frank (CT)
Bentsen	Coyne	Frank (NJ)
Bereuter	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Berman	Crane	Frisa
Bevill	Crapo	Frost
Billbray	Cremeans	Funderburk
Billrakis	Cubin	Furse
Bishop	Cunningham	Gallely
Bliley	Danner	Ganske
Blute	Davis	Gejdenson
Boehlert	de la Garza	Gekas
Boehner	Deal	Gephardt
Bonilla	DeFazio	Geren
Bonior	DeLauro	Gibbons
Bono	DeLay	Gilchrest
Borski	Dellums	Gillmor
Boucher	Deutscher	Gilman
Browder	Diaz-Balart	Gonzalez
Brown (CA)	Dickey	Goodlatte
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Goodling
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Gordon
Brownback	Dixon	Goss
Bryant (TN)	Doggett	Graham
Bryant (TX)	Dooley	Green
Bunn	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bunning	Doyle	Gunderson
Burr	Dreier	Gutierrez
Burton	Duncan	Gutknecht
Buyer	Dunn	Hall (OH)
Calvert	Durbin	Hall (TX)
Camp	Edwards	Hamilton
Canady	Ehlers	Hancock
Cardin	Ehrlich	Hansen
Castle	Emerson	Harman
Chabot	Engel	Hastert
Chambliss	English	Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA) McInnis Scarborough
 Hayworth McIntosh Schaefer
 Hefley McKeon Schiff
 Hefner McKinney Schroeder
 Heineman McNulty Schumer
 Herger Meehan Scott
 Hilleary Meek Seastrand
 Hilliard Menendez Sensenbrenner
 Hinchey Metcalf Serrano
 Hobson Meyers Shadegg
 Hoekstra Mfume Shaw
 Hoke Mica Shays
 Holden Miller (CA) Shuster
 Horn Miller (FL) Sisisky
 Hostettler Minge Skaggs
 Houghton Mink Skeen
 Hoyer Moakley Skelton
 Hunter Molinari Slaughter
 Hutchinson Mollohan Smith (MI)
 Hyde Montgomery Smith (NJ)
 Istook Moorhead Smith (TX)
 Jackson-Lee Moran Smith (WA)
 Jefferson Morella Souder
 Johnson (CT) Murtha Spence
 Johnson (SD) Myers Spratt
 Johnson, E. B. Myrick Stark
 Johnson, Sam Nadler Stearns
 Johnston Nethercutt Stenholm
 Jones Ney Stokes
 Kanjorski Norwood Studds
 Kaptur Nussle Stump
 Kasich Oberstar Stupak
 Kelly Obey Tanner
 Kennedy (MA) Oliver Tate
 Kennedy (RI) Ortiz Tauzin
 Kennelly Orton Taylor (MS)
 Kildee Owens Taylor (NC)
 Kim Packard Tejeda
 King Pallone Thomas
 Kingston Parker Thornberry
 Kleczka Pastor Thornton
 Klink Paxon Thurman
 Klug Payne (NJ) Tiahrt
 Knollenberg Payne (VA) Torricelli
 Kolbe Pelosi Torres
 LaFalce Peterson (FL) Traffant
 LaHood Peterson (MN) Upton
 Lantos Petri Velazquez
 Largent Pickett Vento
 Latham Pombo Visclosky
 LaTourette Pomeroy Volkmer
 Laughlin Porter Vucanovich
 Lazio Portman Walsh
 Leach Poshard Wamp
 Levin Quillen Waldholtz
 Lewis (CA) Quinn Walker
 Lewis (GA) Radanovich Walsh
 Lewis (KY) Rahall Wamp
 Lightfoot Ramstad Ward
 Lincoln Rangel Watt (NC)
 Linder Reed Watts (OK)
 Lipinski Regula Weldon (FL)
 Livingston Richardson Weller
 LoBlundo Riggs White
 Lofgren Rivers Whitfield
 Longley Roberts Wicker
 Lowey Roemer Williams
 Lucas Rogers Wise
 Luther Rohrabacher Wolf
 Maloney Ros-Lehtinen Woolsey
 Manton Rose Wyden
 Manzullo Roth Wynn
 Markey Roukema Yates
 Martinez Roybal-Allard Young (AK)
 Martini Royce Young (FL)
 Mascara Rush Zelliff
 Matsui Sabo Zimmer
 McCarthy Salmon
 McCollum Sanders
 McDade Sanford
 McHale Sawyer
 McHugh Saxton

NOT VOTING—16

Baker (LA) Jacobs Tucker
 Brewster McCrery Waxman
 Callahan McDermott Weldon (PA)
 Dornan Neumann Wilson
 Fields (LA) Oxley
 Hayes Pryce

□ 1444

So, (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 32, nays 361, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 819]

YEAS—32

Barton	Hastert	Roberts
Bliley	Hostettler	Roth
Bunning	Houghton	Shuster
Burr	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Clinger	Largent	Souder
Coble	Linder	Talent
Combest	Myers	Thomas
Dreier	Nussle	Thornberry
Ehrlich	Packard	Waldholtz
Greenwood	Porter	Young (AK)
Gutknecht	Radanovich	

NAYS—361

Abercrombie	Castle	Durbin
Allard	Chabot	Edwards
Andrews	Chambliss	Ehlers
Archer	Chapman	Emerson
Armey	Chenoweth	Engel
Baesler	Christensen	English
Baker (CA)	Chrysler	Ensign
Baldacci	Clement	Eshoo
Bailenger	Clyburn	Evans
Barcia	Coburn	Everett
Barr	Coleman	Ewing
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Farr
Barrett (WI)	Collins (IL)	Fattah
Bartlett	Collins (MI)	Fawell
Bass	Condit	Fazio
Bateman	Conyers	Fields (TX)
Becerra	Cooley	Flner
Beilenson	Costello	Flanagan
Bentsen	Cox	Foglietta
Bereuter	Coyne	Foley
Berman	Cramer	Forbes
Bevill	Crapo	Ford
Billbray	Creams	Fox
Bishop	Cubin	Frank (MA)
Blute	Cunningham	Franks (CT)
Boehner	Davis	Franks (NJ)
Bonilla	de la Garza	Frelinghuysen
Bonior	Deal	Frisa
Bono	DeFazio	Frost
Borski	DeLauro	Funderburk
Boucher	DeLay	Furse
Browder	Dellums	Gallegly
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Ganske
Brown (FL)	Dickey	Gekas
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Gephardt
Brownback	Dingell	Geren
Bryant (TN)	Dixon	Gibbons
Bryant (TX)	Doggett	Gilchrest
Bunn	Dooley	Gillmor
Burton	Doolittle	Gilman
Calvert	Doyle	Gonzalez
Camp	Duncan	Goodlatte
Canady	Dunn	Goodling
Cardin		

Gordon	Manzullo	Rush
Goss	Markey	Sabo
Graham	Martinez	Salmon
Green	Martini	Sanford
Gunderson	Mascara	Sawyer
Gutierrez	Matsui	Saxton
Hall (OH)	McCarthy	Seastrand
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Schaefer
Hamilton	McDade	Schiff
Hancock	McHale	Schroeder
Hansen	McHugh	Schumer
Harman	McInnis	Scott
Hastings (FL)	McIntosh	Seastrand
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hayworth	McKinney	Serrano
Hefley	McNulty	Shadegg
Hefner	Meehan	Shays
Heineman	Meek	Sisisky
Herger	Menendez	Skaggs
Hilleary	Metcalf	Skeen
Hilliard	Meyers	Skelton
Hinchey	Mfume	Slaughter
Hobson	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hoekstra	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Hoke	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Holden	Minge	Spence
Horn	Mink	Spratt
Hoyer	Molinari	Stark
Hunter	Mollohan	Stearns
Hutchinson	Montgomery	Stenholm
Hyde	Moorhead	Stockman
Istook	Moran	Stokes
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Studds
Jefferson	Murtha	Stump
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Stupak
Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Tate
Johnson, Sam	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Johnston	Ney	Taylor (MS)
Jones	Norwood	Tejeda
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thompson
Kaptur	Obey	Thorn
Kasich	Oliver	Thurman
Kelly	Ortiz	Tiahrt
Kennedy (MA)	Orton	Torricelli
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Torres
Kennelly	Pallone	Torricelli
Kildee	Parker	Towns
Kim	Pastor	Traffant
King	Paxon	Upton
Kleczka	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Klink	Payne (VA)	Vento
Klug	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kolbe	Peterson (FL)	Volkmer
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Vucanovich
LaHood	Petri	Walker
Lantos	Pickett	Walsh
Largent	Pombo	Ward
Latham	Pomeroy	Waters
LaTourette	Portman	Watt (NC)
Laughlin	Poshard	Watts (OK)
Lazio	Quillen	Weldon (FL)
Leach	Rahall	Weller
Levin	Ramstad	White
Lewis (CA)	Rangel	Whitfield
Lewis (GA)	Reed	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Williams
Lightfoot	Richardson	Wise
Lincoln	Riggs	Wolf
Linder	Rivers	Woolsey
Lipinski	Roemer	Wyden
Livingston	Rogers	Wynn
LoBlundo	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen	Zelliff
Longley	Rose	Zimmer
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	
Lucas	Royce	
Luther		
Maloney		
Manton		
Manzullo		
Markey		
Martinez		
Martini		
Mascara		
Matsui		
McCarthy		
McCollum		
McDade		
McHale		
McHugh		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buyer

NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman	Dornan	Moakley
Bachus	Fields (LA)	Neumann
Baker (LA)	Fowler	Oxley
Billakis	Gedden	Pryce
Boehler	Hayes	Quinn
Brewster	Inglis	Roukema
Callahan	Jacobs	Sanders
Clay	Kingston	Shaw
Crane	Laughlin	Solomon
Danner	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	McDermott	

Tucker
WampWaxman
Weldon (PA)Wilson
Yates

□ 1513

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. EVERETT, BRYANT of Tennessee, and BONILLA, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Messrs. KASICH, SAXTON, LAHOOD, BURTON of Indiana, JONES, and STUMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Messrs. FRANKS of Connecticut, SMITH of New Jersey, QUILLEN, DUNCAN, and HANSEN, Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, FAWELL, BARTLETT of Maryland, SHAYS, BARRETT of Nebraska, BASS, ZIMMER, ZELIFF, COOLEY, ROGERS, and FIELDS of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Goss) at 10 o'clock p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills during the recess today: H.R. 2020, H.R. 2126, and H.R. 2492.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, for the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2492. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, for the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2492. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees of the U.S. House of Representatives during the third and fourth quarters of 1994 and the third quarter of 1995, as well as a report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by a miscellaneous group, U.S. House of Representatives, in connection with official foreign travel, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses	8/28	8/31	Republic of China							3,611.80	3,611.80
Committee total										3,611.80	3,611.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses	11/19	11/21	Belgium				1,620.00		2,665.87		4,285.87
	11/24	11/27	Italy				3,018.13		779.12		3,797.25
Committee total							4,638.13		3,444.99		8,083.12

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses	2/17	2/20	Panama							37.25	37.25
Committee total										37.25	37.25

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APRIL 1 AND JUNE 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses	2/17	2/20	Panama						676.92		676.92
Thomas M. Donnelly	5/30	5/31	Haiti		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							648.95				648.95
Committee total					200.00		648.95		676.92		1,525.87

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. E. de la Garza	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
Committee total					4,694.00		314.05				5,008.05

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, Oct. 25, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tom Bevill	7/1	7/2	United States		167.00		(?)				167.00
	7/2	7/6	Vietnam		1,250.00		(?)				1,250.00
	7/6	7/7	Thailand		213.00		(?)				213.00
Hon. Tom Bevill	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(?)				888.00
	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(?)				666.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(?)				
	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(?)				490.00
	8/12	8/15	Turkey		786.00		(?)				786.00
Hon. Jim Bunn	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		179.65				1,178.65
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
Hon. Jim Chapman	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
Hon. Thomas Foglietta	7/1	7/2	United States		167.00		(?)				167.00
	7/2	7/6	Vietnam		1,250.00		(?)				1,250.00
	7/6	7/8	S. Korea		634.00		(?)				634.00
Commercial airfare							3,345.95				3,345.95
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
Hon. Dan Miller	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Murtha	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
	7/14	7/14	Germany				(?)				
	7/14	7/15	Croatia		60.00		(?)				60.00
	7/15	7/16	Belgium				(?)				
Commercial airfare							5,691.00				5,691.00
Hon. John Myers	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
Hon. Ron Packard	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(?)				888.00
	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(?)				666.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(?)				
	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(?)				490.00
Hon. Harold Rogers	8/12	8/15	Turkey		786.00		(?)				786.00
	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(?)				888.00
	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(?)				666.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(?)				
	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(?)				490.00
Hon. Barbara Vucanovich	8/12	8/15	Turkey		786.00		(?)				786.00
	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
Hon. Charles Wilson	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
	8/30	9/2	Sweden		837.00						837.00
	9/2	9/6	Norway		1,088.00						1,088.00
							1,931.05				1,931.05
Commercial airfare											
Sally Chadbourne	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(?)				888.00
	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(?)				666.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(?)				
	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(?)				490.00
	8/12	8/15	Turkey		786.00		(?)				786.00
Gregory Dahlberg	7/14	7/14	Germany								
	7/14	7/15	Bosnia		60.00						60.00
	7/15	7/16	Belgium								
Commercial airfare							3,180.75				3,180.75
William Inglee	9/8	9/10	Japan		786.00						786.00
	9/10	9/13	S. Korea		801.00						801.00
	9/13	9/16	Indonesia		771.00						771.00
Commercial airfare							4,663.95				4,663.95
James Kulikowski	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(?)				888.00
	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(?)				666.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(?)				
	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(?)				490.00
	8/12	8/15	Turkey		786.00		(?)				786.00
Frederick G. Mohrman	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
Henry E. Moore	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
	8/28	8/30	Kuwait		680.00						680.00
	8/30	9/1	Qatar		450.00						450.00
	9/1	9/2	United Kingdom		296.00						296.00
							5,242.45		150.00		5,392.45
Commercial airfare									62.00		62.00
Michelle Mrdeza	8/12	8/16	Italy		775.88				4.00		780.88
	8/16	8/19	Russia		864.00						864.00
	8/19	8/22	Hungary		549.00				277.60		826.60
Commercial airfare							3,505.15				3,505.15
Juliet Pacquing	8/27	8/29	United Kingdom		650.00						650.00
	8/29	9/1	Italy		650.00						650.00
Commercial airfare							4,109.00				4,109.00
John G. Plaszal	7/14	7/14	Germany								
	7/14	7/15	Bosnia		60.00						60.00
	7/15	7/16	Belgium								
Commercial airfare							3,180.75				3,180.75
John G. Shank	8/22	8/28	Guatemala		631.48						631.48
	8/28	8/30	El Salvador		362.00						362.00
	8/30	9/1	Nicaragua								
Commercial airfare							1,415.95				1,415.95
Jeanne L. Wilson	8/11	8/15	Russia		1,020.00		(?)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine		630.00		(?)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France		999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia		162.00		(?)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	Korea		951.00		(?)				951.00
Committee total	8/24	8/26	Japan		932.00		179.65				1,111.65
					65,754.36		38,823.65		493.60		105,071.61
Surveys and investigations staff:											
Theodore J. Booth	9/1	9/9	Korea		1,756.25		3,415.31		6.00		5,177.56
	9/17	9/23	England		1,060.25		4,041.45		274.79		5,376.49
	9/23	9/26	Germany		393.25						393.25
G. Norman Christensen	9/9	9/14	England		905.50		4,381.87		210.91		5,498.28
	9/14	9/19	Italy		733.00						733.00
	9/9	9/15	Germany		868.75		3,637.81		52.94		4,559.50
Robert D. Green	9/17	9/23	England		1,060.25		4,041.45		255.28		5,356.98
	9/23	9/26	Germany		393.25						393.25
	9/9	9/14	England		938.25		3,283.25		77.05		4,298.55
William P. Haynes	9/14	9/17	Austria		672.00						672.00
	9/17	9/19	Poland		456.00						456.00
	9/19	9/20	Switzerland		254.00						254.00
Dennis K. Lutz	9/20	9/23	Belgium		867.00						867.00
	9/9	9/14	England		905.50		4,671.86		211.14		5,788.50
	9/14	9/19	Italy		733.00						733.00
Henry P. McDonald	9/9	9/15	Germany		868.75		3,185.74		67.55		4,122.04

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David T. Mitchell	9/9	9/15	Germany		685.85		3,269.45		43.60		3,998.90
John D. O'Shaughnessy	9/9	9/14	England		938.25		3,283.25		142.54		4,364.04
	9/14	9/17	Austria		672.00						672.00
	9/17	9/19	Poland		456.00						456.00
	9/19	9/20	Switzerland		254.00						254.00
	9/20	9/23	Belgium		867.00						867.00
Robert J. Reitwiesner	9/9	9/14	England		942.75		4,880.29		303.87		6,126.91
	9/14	9/17	Austria		594.00						594.00
	9/17	9/19	Poland		456.00						456.00
	9/19	9/23	England		813.00						813.00
	9/23	9/26	Germany		363.00						363.00
R.W. Vandergrift	9/14	9/20	Hong Kong		1,645.00		3,458.95		430.28		5,534.23
	9/20	9/25	Thailand		855.75						855.75
Thomas L. Van Derslice	9/9	9/15	Germany		686.75		3,269.45		42.00		3,998.20
Donald C. Witham	9/1	9/9	Korea		1,843.75		3,415.31		7.20		5,266.26
T. Peter Wyman	9/13	9/16	Korea		821.75		4,606.63		227.00		5,655.38
	9/16	9/20	Hong Kong		1,334.50						1,334.50
	9/20	9/25	Thailand		815.00						815.00
	9/25	9/28	Japan		1,199.00						1,199.00
H.C. Young	9/28	9/29	Okinawa		288.75						288.75
	9/13	9/16	Korea		821.75		4,606.63		257.91		5,686.29
	9/16	9/20	Hong Kong		1,334.50						1,334.50
	9/20	9/25	Thailand		815.00						815.00
	9/25	9/28	Japan		1,199.00						1,199.00
	9/28	9/29	Okinawa		288.75						288.75
Committee total					33,856.10		61,448.70		2,610.06		97,914.86

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Nov. 13, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kathleen Holcombe	7/1	7/5	United Kingdom	Pound	984.00		971.75				1,955.75
	7/5	7/7	Belgium	Franc	556.00		(3)				556.00
John Cohnssen	7/1	7/5	United Kingdom	Pound	984.00		760.65				1,744.65
	7/5	7/7	Belgium	Franc	556.00		2,556.00				812.00
	7/7	7/8	France	Franc	283.00		92.78				375.78
Hon. John Dingell	8/12	8/15	Russia	Ruble	1,020.00		(4)				1,020.00
	8/15	8/17	Ukraine	Ruble	630.00		(4)				630.00
	8/17	8/20	France	Franc	999.00		134.40				1,133.40
	8/20	8/21	Russia	Ruble	162.00		(4)				162.00
	8/21	8/24	South Korea	Won	951.00		(4)				951.00
	8/24	8/26	Japan	Yen	932.00		179.65				1,111.65
Catherine Van Way	8/21	8/25	Switzerland	Franc	1,016.00		800.15				1,816.15
Robert Meyers	8/27	9/1	Switzerland	Franc	1,524.00		3,282.85				4,806.85
Committee total					10,597.00		6,478.23				17,075.23

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Included with reimbursement issued to John Cohnssen.⁴ Military air transportation.TOM BLILEY,
Chairman, Oct. 19, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Constance Morella	9/2	9/8	China		6,351.00		4,163.95		449.54		10,964.49
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	9/2	9/8	China		6,351.00		4,404.95		449.55		11,205.50
Committee total					12,702.00		8,568.90		899.09		22,169.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.BILL CLINGER,
Chairman, Oct. 31, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ike Skelton	8/07	8/08	Spain		564.00						564.00
	8/08	8/09	Gibraltar		0.00						0.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	8/09	8/10	Italy		197.00						197.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	8/10	8/13	Turkey		786.00						786.00
	8/13	8/16	England		912.00						912.00
	8/16	8/18	Belgium		432.00						432.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	8/07	8/08	Spain		564.00						564.00
	8/08	8/09	Gibraltar		0.00						0.00
	8/09	8/10	Italy		197.00						197.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	8/10	8/13	Turkey		786.00						786.00
	8/13	8/16	England		912.00						912.00
	8/16	8/18	Belgium		432.00						432.00
Hon. Chet Edwards	8/07	8/08	Spain		564.00						564.00
	8/08	8/09	Gibraltar		0.00						0.00
	8/09	8/10	Italy		197.00						197.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	8/10	8/13	Turkey		786.00						786.00
	8/13	8/16	England		912.00						912.00
	8/16	8/18	Belgium		432.00						432.00
John D. Chapla	8/07	8/08	Spain		564.00						564.00
	8/08	8/09	Gibraltar		0.00						0.00
	8/09	8/10	Italy		197.00						197.00
	8/10	8/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	8/15	8/16	Slovakia		394.00						394.00
	8/16	8/18	Belgium		432.00						432.00
Commercial airfare							252.00				252.00
Delegation expenses	8/10	8/13	Turkey				1,040.01		42.16		1,082.17
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	8/10	8/13	Israel		749.00						749.00
	8/13	8/15	Greece		490.00				1,372.00		1,862.00
	8/15	8/18	Italy		1,175.00						1,175.00
	8/18	8/20	Portugal		250.00						250.00
Commercial airfare							4,251.25				4,251.25
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	8/18	8/23	Belgium		656.00						656.00
	8/23	8/25	Estonia		406.00						406.00
	8/25	8/27	Romania		488.00						488.00
	8/27	8/30	Norway		816.00						816.00
	8/30	9/1	Denmark		529.92						529.92
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	8/18	8/23	Belgium		656.00						656.00
	8/23	8/25	Estonia		406.00						406.00
	8/25	8/27	Romania		488.00						488.00
	8/27	8/30	Norway		816.00						816.00
	8/30	9/1	Denmark		529.92						529.92
Hon. Steve Buyer	8/18	8/23	Belgium		656.00						656.00
	8/23	8/25	Estonia		406.00						406.00
	8/25	8/27	Romania		488.00						488.00
	8/27	8/30	Norway		816.00						816.00
	8/30	9/1	Denmark		529.92						529.92
Peter M. Steffes	8/18	8/23	Belgium		656.00						656.00
	8/23	8/25	Estonia		406.00						406.00
	8/25	8/27	Romania		488.00						488.00
	8/27	8/30	Norway		816.00						816.00
	8/30	9/1	Denmark		529.92						529.92
Hon. Jane Harman	8/30	9/1	Denmark		529.92						529.92
Commercial airfare							3,900.95				3,900.95
Hon. Paul McHale	8/29	8/30	Italy		150.00						150.00
	8/30	8/30	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	8/30	9/2	Croatia		714.00						714.00
Commercial airfare							2,977.35				2,977.35
Committee total					25,901.60		12,421.56		1,414.16		39,737.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gary Ackerman	8/19	8/24	Taiwan		1,365.00						1,365.00
	8/24	8/27	South Korea		951.00						1,129.52
	8/27	8/29	France		666.00				178.52		666.00
Commercial airfare							7,233.35				7,233.35
Paul Behrends	7/10	7/11	Hong Kong		364.00						364.00
	7/11	7/13	Vietnam		(¹) 620.00						620.00
	7/13	7/14	Thailand		213.00						213.00
	7/14	7/14	Burma		14.00						14.00
	7/14	7/15	Hong Kong		364.00						364.00
Commercial airfare							4,038.95				4,038.95
Hon. Doug Bereuter	8/25	8/30	South Korea		1,585.00						1,585.00
	8/30	9/2	China		(¹) 914.00						914.00
Commercial airfare							3,848.95		214.11		4,063.06
Hon. Howard Berman	8/23	8/24	Japan		932.00						932.00
	7/10	7/11	Hong Kong		364.00						364.00
Paul Berkowitz	7/11	7/13	Vietnam		(¹) 620.00						620.00
	7/13	7/14	Thailand		213.00						213.00
	7/14	7/14	Burma		14.00						14.00
	7/14	7/15	Hong Kong		364.00						364.00
Commercial airfare							4,038.95				4,038.95
Marian Chambers	8/12	8/16	Israel		1,009.00						1,009.00
	8/16	8/20	Syria		1,355.00						1,355.00
Commercial airfare							3,083.65				3,083.65

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michael Ennis	8/25	8/30	South Korea		1,585.00						1,585.00
David Feltman	8/30	9/2	China		(³) 907.00						907.00
David Feltman	7/1	7/4	Morocco		1,028.00						1,028.00
David Feltman	7/4	7/5	Tunisia		161.00						161.00
David Feltman	7/5	7/7	Switzerland		590.00						590.00
Commercial airfare							4,310.55				4,310.55
David Feltman	8/16	8/24	Taiwan		2,184.00						2,184.00
David Feltman	8/24	8/27	South Korea		951.00						951.00
David Feltman	8/27	8/29	France		666.00						666.00
Commercial airfare							6,882.55				6,882.55
Victor Frazer	7/2	7/6	Vietnam		³ 1,009.00		(⁴)				1,009.00
Victor Frazer	7/6	7/7	Thailand		213.00		(⁴)				213.00
Mark Gage	8/27	9/2	Russia		³ 2,750.00						2,750.00
Commercial airfare							3,024.95				3,024.95
Kristen Gilley	7/5	7/8	Canada		595.00						595.00
Commercial airfare							679.88				679.88
Kristen Gilley	9/3	9/7	China		1,752.00						1,752.00
Commercial airfare	9/7	9/10	Czech Republic		740.00						740.00
David Gordon	8/24	8/29	Nigeria		561.00						561.00
Commercial airfare							3,911.00				3,911.00
Harry Johnston	8/5	8/8	Ethiopia		375.00						375.00
Harry Johnston	8/8	8/10	Sudan		150.00						150.00
Harry Johnston	8/10	8/13	Kenya		630.00				95.60		725.60
Harry Johnston	8/13	8/14	London		290.00						290.00
John Mackey	7/5	7/8	Canada		595.00						595.00
Commercial airfare							679.88				679.88
John Mackey	8/12	8/16	Argentina		1,168.00				245.00		1,413.00
Commercial airfare	8/16	8/19	Colombia		792.00						792.00
Christopher Madison	9/8	9/10	Czech Republic		510.00						510.00
Commercial airfare							2,954.95				2,954.95
Lester Munson	8/24	8/29	Nigeria		³ 486.00						486.00
Commercial airfare							3,911.00				3,911.00
Lester Munson	7/1	7/4	Morocco		1,028.00						1,028.00
Lester Munson	7/4	7/5	Tunisia		161.00						161.00
Lester Munson	7/5	7/7	Switzerland		590.00						590.00
Commercial airfare							4,310.55				4,310.55
Roger Noriega	8/12	8/16	Argentina		1,168.00						1,168.00
Commercial airfare	8/16	8/19	Colombia		792.00						792.00
Daniel Restrepo	8/14	8/16	Argentina		876.00						876.00
Commercial airfare	8/16	8/19	Colombia		³ 717.00						717.00
Frank Record	8/9	8/11	Macedonia		600.00						600.00
Frank Record	8/11	8/12	Greece		249.00				652.00		901.00
Frank Record	8/12	8/15	Israel		1,009.00						1,009.00
Frank Record	8/16	8/20	Syria		³ 1,180.00						1,180.00
Commercial airfare							3,944.45				3,944.45
Hon. Toby Roth	9/22	9/26	Germany		1,184.00						1,184.00
Commercial airfare							5,807.55				5,807.55
Mara Rudman	9/4	9/8	China		1,752.00						1,752.00
Commercial airfare							3,936.95				3,936.95
Committee total					43,921.00		83,084.76		1,385.23		128,390.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Represents refund of unused per diem.⁴ Military air transportation.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, Oct. 30, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Pat Danner	8/5	8/8	Great Britain		888.00		(³)				888.00
Pat Danner	8/8	8/10	France		666.00		(³)				666.00
Pat Danner	8/10	8/10	Macedonia				(³)				
Pat Danner	8/10	8/12	Greece		490.00		(³)				490.00
Hon. Bob Borski	8/12	8/13	Turkey		786.00		(³)				786.00
Hon. Bob Borski	8/12	8/13	Great Britain		296.00						296.00
Hon. Bob Borski	8/14	8/21	India		1,632.00						1,632.00
Commercial airfare							5,448.95				5,448.95
Committee total					4,758.00		5,448.95				10,206.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Oct. 27, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Phil Crane	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(³)				406

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Charles Rangel	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
Hon. L.F. Payne	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/5	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
Hon. William Thomas	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Hon. Rob Portman	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Hon. Sam Gibbons	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Hon. Greg Laughlin	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/22	8/23	Italy		152		(2)				152
	8/23	8/24	Slovenia		334		(2)				334
Commercial airfare	8/25	8/26	Croatia		376		(2)				376
	8/27	8/28	Macedonia		149		(2)				149
	8/28	8/29	Albania		105		(2)				105
	8/29	8/30	Italy		430		(2)				430
Thelma Askey	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Frank Phifer	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
Meredith Broadbent	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
Bruce Wilson	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Karen Humbel	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
Keith Jewell	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
	8/9	8/10	Argentina		292		(2)				292
	8/4	8/6	Costa Rica		406		(2)				406
	8/6	8/9	Chile		765		(2)				765
Committee total					20,565.00		2,879.65				23,444.65

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Oct. 17, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN
JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bill Richardson	7/14	7/18	Middle East		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial airfare							7,245.95				7,245.95
Calvin Humphrey	7/14	7/18	Middle East		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial airfare							7,245.95				7,245.95
Ken Kodama	8/12	8/23	Europe		2,826.00		218.00				3,044.00
Commercial airfare							4,005.15				4,005.15
Michael Sheehy	8/13	8/17	Europe		750.00		45.00				795.00
Commercial airfare							4,514.95				4,514.95
Hon. Bob Dornan	8/22	8/31	Europe		1,546.00						1,546.00
Commercial airfare							2,879.65				2,879.65
Michael Meermans	8/22	8/31	Europe		1,546.00						1,546.00
Commercial airfare							2,879.65				2,879.65
Committee total					8,668.00		29,034.30				37,702.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Oct. 23, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1
AND SEPT. 30, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig		8/24	United States				3,162.05				3,162.05
Ronald McNamara	8/25	9/30	Austria		5,305.69						5,305.69
		7/5	United States				283.73				283.73
	7/5	7/6	Canada		305.17						305.17

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1995—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michael Ochs		6/26	United States				4,399.65				4,399.65
	6/29	7/6	Armenia		1,012.00		500.00				1,512.00
	7/6	7/10	Georgia		852.00		110.00				962.00
	7/10	7/12	Azerbaijan		356.00						356.00
	7/12	7/13	Turkey		176.00						176.00
Samuel Wise		7/3	United States				559.20				559.20
	7/3	7/8	Canada		621.67				10.45		632.12
	9/16	9/15	United States				3,438.85				3,438.85
		9/20	Austria		792.00						792.00
Committee total					9,420.53		12,453.48		10.45		21,884.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Commercial airfare in addition to military air transportation.

CHRIS SMITH,
Oct. 16, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 4 AND OCT. 10, 1995

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency ¹	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Ralph Regula	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Marge Roukema	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Jan Meyers	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Porter Goss	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,180.00		(3)				1,180.00
Hon. Vernon Ehlers	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Charlie Rose	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Cardiss Collins	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Hon. Bobby Rush	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
John Herzberg	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		3,033.85				3,948.85
Ronald Lasch	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		3,033.85				3,948.85
Carol Doherty	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		3,033.85				3,948.85
Jo Weber	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		(3)				915.00
Commercial airfare							2,037.00				2,952.00
Michael Ennis	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Jim Doran	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Linda Pedigo	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
Martin Sietzinger	10/4	10/10	Italy		1,192.00		(3)				1,192.00
David Hobbs	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		(3)				915.00
Commercial airfare							2,037.00				2,952.00
Veronica Craig	10/5	10/10	Italy		915.00		(3)				915.00
Commercial airfare							2,037.00				2,952.00
Committee total					25,642.00		15,212.55				40,854.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER,
Oct. 24, 1995.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of November 17, 1995]

Mr. KASICH: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2491. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution the budget for fiscal year 1996 (Rept. 104-350). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted November 18, 1995]

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 279. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (Rept. 104-354). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 280. Resolution waiving points of

order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 140-355). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BURR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr.

DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MICA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr.

SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TATE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. HASTERT).

H.R. 2664. A bill to revise the effective date for military retiree cost-of-living adjustments for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. FOX (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MARTINI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants and contracts to establish domestic violence community response teams and a technical assistance center to address the development and support of such community response teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H.R. 2666. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 123: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 303: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 468: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1791: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1884: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1993: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2310: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KING, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2311: Mr. FRAZER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2508: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 2510: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2599: Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 124: Mr. DAVIS.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. ORTIZ.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6 by Mr. BRYANT of Texas on House Resolution 240: Karen L. Thurman, John M. Spratt, Jr., Henry A. Waxman, Eddie Bernice Johnson, and Gene Taylor.

Petition 7 by Mr. KANJORSKI on House Resolution 246: Sam Gejdenson, Lynn N. Rivers, John Lewis, and Cynthia McKinney.